DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 607 CG 007 602

AUTHOR	Peck, Robert F.
TITLE	Coping Styles and Achievement: A Cross-National Study of School Children. Volume III of VII Volumes. Parental Views of Themselves and Their Children in Eight Countries.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	522p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$19.74
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement; *Adjustment (to Environment); Beliefs; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Differences; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Culture; Interviews; Parental Background; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Reaction; *Values

ABSTRACT

Interviews were conducted with all of the mothers and about half of the fathers of a stratified sample of school children whose achievement, motivation, occupational interests and coping styles had been assessed. The parents of 80 children in each of eight countries participated: Brazil, Mexico, England, West Germany, Italy, Yugoslavia, Japan, and the United States. The systematically structured interview focused on the coping styles of the parents; their perception of the child's attitudes, achievement and coping styles; and the parents' occupational lives. Their beliefs about the role and value of education were also explored. The parents' responses were coded into content-categories for each question in the interview. The frequency of each kind of response was used to describe the characteristics of parents and children within each country. The responses of matched mothers and fathers were also compared and described, to determine the amount and kind of consistent agreement in their values, their self-descriptions and their perceptions of their child. (Author)

ED 067607

BRS-0122

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT: A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

Volume III of VII Volumes

PARENTAL VIEWS OF THEMSELVES AND THEIR CHILDREN IN EIGHT COUNTRIES

ROBERT F. PECK

Principal Investigator
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex Room 3.203
Austin, Texas 78712
U.S.A.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
Occupational Research and Development,
Department of Occupational and Technical Education

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CG

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. SO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 007 602

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FINAL REPORT Project No. HRD-167-65, Contract No. OE-5-85-063, Contract No. 29390

ED 067607

FINAL REPORT
Project No. HRD-167-65
Contract No. OE-5-85-063
Contract No. 29390

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT: A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

VOLUME III of VII VOLUMES

PARENTAL VIEWS OF THEMSELVES AND THEIR CHILDREN IN EIGHT COUNTRIES

Participating Investigators

Arrigo L. Angelini, Brazil
Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero, Mexico
Kenneth M. Miller, England
Walther Jaide, West Germany
Franz Weinert, West Germany
Rolf Piquardt, West Germany
Leon Zorman, Yugoslavia
Ivan Tolicic, Yugoslavia
Marcello Cesa-Bianchi, Italy
Robert J. Havighurst, U.S.A.
Shunichi Kubo, Japan

Robert F. Peck
The University of Texas at Austin
Education Annex Room 3.203
Austin, Texas 78712
U.S.A.

August 15, 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and The Texas Education Agency. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education or Texas Education Agency position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Occupational Research and Development,
Department of Occupational and Technical Education

FOREWORD

The very large, complex testing program required for the study, involving several thousand children in each country, could not have been carried out with the accuracy and completeness which were so vitally necessary, without the extremely hard, thoughtful, dedicated effort of the research staff in each of the participating centers. Thereafter, the development of truly uniform scoring systems for the many instruments and the actual scoring of thousands of protocols were also the product of these researchers, led by the principal investigators. It scarcely does justice to their conscientious, deeply insightful work merely to list their names. But that, at least, must be done, as a very small token of the gratitude each one of them so richly deserves. Station by station, here are the people who carried out the work of the study.

Sao Paulo, Brazil

Prof. Arrigo L. Angelini, Principal Investigator
Mrs. Hebe R. C. Angelini, Research Assistant
Mrs. Geraldina P. Witter, Research Assistant
Mr. Fernando B. Lomonaco, Research Assistant
Miss Maria Helena S. Patto, Research Assistant
Mr. Antonio P. Agatti, Research Assistant
Mrs. Carmen S. Andalo, Research Assistant
Mr. Romeu M. Almeida, Research Assistant
Miss Quelita R. Correa, Secretary
Mr. Luiz T. Aragao, Data Clerk
Mrs. Wilma A. Gebara, Data Clerk

Mexico City, Mexico

Dr. Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero, Principal Investigator
L. Lara Tapia, Sub-Director of Research
Ma. Luisa Morales, Senior Research Assistant
Alicia M. Velazquez, Junior Research Assistant
Rene Ahumada, Junior Research Assistant
Isa Ahumada, Junior Research Assistant
Ma. de la Luz Fernandez, Junior Research Assistant

London, England

Dr. Kenneth M. Miller, Principal Investigator
Mrs. Margaret Miller, Senior Investigator
M. Nicol, Research Associate
S. Spensley, Research Assistant
E. Leffman, Secretary
M. Plendenleith, Data Clerk/Secretary

Milano, Italy

Dr. M. Cesa-Bianchi, Principal Investigator
Dr. P. Calegari, Research Assistant
Dr. Laura Scalera, Research Assistant
Dr. G. Brasco, Research Assistant
Dr. D. Gallotti, Research Assistant
Dr. M. Polizzi, Research Assistant
Mr. R. Noe, Part-time Collaborator
Mr. L. Pliteri, Part-time Collaborator
Miss V. Savoia, Part-time Collaborator
Mr. M. Libutti, Part-time Collaborator
Mr. W. Di Chio, Secretary
Mr. L. Penck, Secretary
Mr. M. Zamberletti, Secretary
Mrs. F. Cavalli, Secretary
Mrs. G. Lupatin, Secretary
Mrs. M. Zamberletti, Data Clerk
Miss M. Zamberletti, Data Clerk
Miss L. Schilton, Data Clerk
Mrs. R. Sinisi, Data Clerk
Miss S. Ricci, Data Clerk
Mrs. Pandiani, Data Clerk

Ljubljana, Yugoslavia

Dr. Leon Zorman, Principal Investigator
Dr. Ivan Tolicic, Principal Investigator

Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Dr. Robert Havighurst, Principal Investigator
Dr. Guy Manaster, Research Associate III
Rena Appel, Secretary
Joyce Bolinger, Research Assistant
Sandra Drake, Research Assistant
Lynda Hoffman, Research Assistant
June Isaacson, Research Assistant
Hellgard Rauh, Research Assistant
Joel Rich, Research Assistant
Beba Varadachar, Research Assistant
Jacqueline Wallen, Research Assistant
Peggy Frazier, Secretary
Edythe Havighurst, Secretary

Austin, Texas, U.S.A.

Dr. Robert F. Peck, Principal Investigator
Dr. Carl Finley Hereford, Associate Director, 1965-1967
Dr. Walter F. Stenning, Research Scientist
Dr. Owen R. Pratz, Social Science Research Associate V
Luiz F. Natalicio, Social Science Research Associate IV
Elaine Abbott Michelis, Social Science Research Associate IV
Joel R. Levy, Social Science Research Associate III
Thomas K. Saville, Social Science Research Associate III
Robert L. Shaw, Social Science Research Associate III
Wilford A. Lawrence, Social Science Research Associate II
Liliana Baltra, Social Science Research Associate II
Susan J. Deline, Social Science Research Assistant II
William E. Lakins, Social Science Research Associate II
Marilyn Doris Strauss, Social Science Research Associate II
Lawrence W. Wilkinson, Social Science Research Associate II
Una Jacqueline Winfrey Calkins, Social Science Research Associate II
John Edward Schultz, Social Science Research Assistant II
Ralph W. Nemir, Social Science Research Assistant II
Elds Alicia Alva, Social Science Research Associate I
John Avant, Social Science Research Associate I
Dick Sullivan Calkins, Social Science Research Associate I
Stuart Frager, Social Science Research Associate I
Camille Thom Lynch, Social Science Research Associate I
Eleanor Anne Newton, Social Science Research Associate I
Janis Ann Ratzlow, Social Science Research Associate I
Anne Raynes, Social Science Research Associate I
Clydette D. Sitton, Social Science Research Associate I
Diana Crow Stenning, Social Science Research Associate I
John Sheffield, Social Science Research Associate IV
Jim Sherrill, Computer Programmer I
James Buchanan, Computer Programmer I
Dale Varnum Clark, Computer Programmer I
Margery L. Barton, Keypunch Operator II
Alice Marie Isbell, Keypunch Operator I
Martha J. Knight, Keypunch Operator I
David Shaut, Editor
Natalie Elizabeth Leyendecker, Administrative Secretary
Margaret Valeintine Wheeler, Administrative Secretary
Kay Audrey Lambert Bunce, Senior Secretary
Violeta Juana Chiok, Senior Secretary
Frances Jean Gibson Turner, Senior Secretary
Elma F. Frieling, Administrative Secretary
Martha Ann Caylor, Senior Clerk-Typist
Martha June Skinner, Senior Clerk-Typist
Susan Clements, Senior Clerk-Typist
Joan Foss, Senior Clerk-Typist
Kathryn L. Baker, Senior Clerk-Typist
Marsha Claire Ashely, Clerk-Typist
Joanne F. Howard, Clerk-Typist

Susan Lenz, Clerk-Typist
Sandi Kaye Leyendecker, Clerk-Typist
Cheryl Raindl Maxwell, Clerk-Typist
Linda Sue Yarbrough, Clerk-Typist
Macyl A. Burke, Jr., Statistical Clerk I
Mary Scott Champ, Statistical Clerk I
Eva E. Littrell, Statistical Clerk
Bonnie Huey-Chen Chiang, Clerk
Clara Crow, Clerk
Joyce E. Gander, Clerk
Maria Madalena Monteiro, Clerk
Thomas F. Rider, Clerical Assistant

Tokyo, Japan

Dr. Masunori Hiratsuka, Director, National Institute for Educational Research
Prof. Michio Nishibori, Administrative Director
Prof. Shunichi Kubo, Principal Investigator
Dr. Eiichi Kajita, Principal Investigator
Kanichi Takagi, Prof. of Psychology, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
Masatoshi Seya, Assistant Prof. of Educational Psychology, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
Ryoichiro Kosen, Assistant Prof. of Educational Psychology, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo
Masaaki Yoshida, Assistant Prof. of Educational Psychology, Japan Womens University, Tokyo
Yasua Aoyagi, Researcher - Kazuko Kunieda, Secretary
Michiko Kubo, Secretary - Yoshiko Yamazaki, Translator
Junko Honma, Data Clerk - Sachiko Toki, Data Clerk

West Germany

Dr. Walther Jaide, Principal Investigator, Hannover, West Germany
Dr. Franz Weinert, Principal Investigator, Heidelberg, West Germany
Dr. Rolf Piquardt, Principal Investigator, Koblenz, West Germany
Dr. Barbara Hille, Hannover, West Germany
Mr. Lothar Quack, Heidelberg, West Germany

The basic computer programs for all of these analyses were originally designed by Dr. Donald Veldman of The University of Texas at Austin, who gave invaluable advice at many stages throughout the study. The analyses for this volume were programmed and carried out by John Sheffield and James Buchanan.

A large share of gratitude is due to Mrs. Mary Purcell, Mrs. Hazel Witzke, and Miss Linda Flowers, for their expert help in the preparation of the final manuscripts for these reports.

Although they are named in the list of staff members in the Austin station, special recognition must be given to Elaine Michelis and Elma Frieling. Mrs Michelis worked on the study from its beginning in 1965 until its completion in 1972. She edited much of the final manuscript for this volume. Mrs. Frieling has served as executive secretary to the project for its final two years, meticulously organizing the literally thousands of details which had to be brought together and kept together in order to bring the project to a successful completion.

To Dr. Oliver Bown, my partner of many years and co-director with me of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, I owe a great debt of gratitude for the many months, over these seven years, when he has single-handedly managed the R & D Center at those times when I had to be abroad, working with my colleagues in this international study.

All of us feel a deep gratitude to Dr. Alice Scates of the U.S Office of Education for her original encouragement and the continuing, wise guidance she has given us over the years. Similarly, we are intensely grateful for the unflaggingly patient, understanding help given by Dr. Clay Brittain, Dr. Judith Weinstein, Dr. Susan Klein and Dr. Laurence Goebel, the officers in charge of the project for the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. John R. Guemple and Dr. Oscar Millican of the Texas Education Agency gave indispensable support in the final phase of the project. Without their help, these volumes of reports could not have been produced. The most literal debts of all are owed to the Congress of the United States, to the Research Division of the Vocational Education Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, and to the Texas Education Agency, for providing the financial support without which this basic study could not have been carried out.

Robert Peck
Austin, Texas
August, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME III of VII VOLUMES
PARENTAL VIEWS OF THEMSELVES AND THEIR CHILDREN IN EIGHT COUNTRIES

TITLE PAGE

FOREWORD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

SECTION I
OVERVIEW

Introduction . . . . I - 1

SECTION II
FINDINGS: INTRACOUNTRY REPORTS

Figure 1 . . . . II - 9

BRAZIL, SAO PAULO
Introduction . . . . II - 35

Mother Description
  Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 40
  Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 69

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 85

MEXICO, MEXICO CITY
Introduction . . . . II - 90

Mother Description
  Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 94
  Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 116

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 133

ENGLAND, LONDON
Introduction . . . . II - 137

Mother Description
  Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 139
  Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 163

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 182

GERMANY, WEST GERMANY

Introduction . . . . II - 187

Mother Description

Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 189
Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 211

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - *

ITALY, MILAN

Introduction . . . . II - 224

Mother Description

Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 225
Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 246

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 264

YUGOSLAVIA, LJUBLJANA

Introduction . . . . II - 271

Mother Description

Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 271
Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 292

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 307

UNITED STATES
CHICAGO (METROPOLITAN AREA)

Introduction . . . . II - 310

Mother Description

Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 313
Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 333

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 349

UNITED STATES
AUSTIN, TEXAS

Introduction . . . . II - 353

Mother Description

Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 354
Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 387

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 403

*Fathers were not interviewed in Germany therefore there is not a Mother/Father Comparison in Germany.

JAPAN, TOKYO

Introduction . . . . II - 411

Mother Description
  Chi-Square Report . . . . II - 412
  Inter-correlations of Scale Scores. . . . . II - 432

Mother/Father Comparisons - Mother/Father Chi-Square . II - 450

SECTION III
FINDINGS: INTERCOUNTRY COMPARISONS - Mother data only

Figure 2 . . . . III - 455

Intercountry Chi-Square: Country, Age, Class, Sex . . III - 496

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Intercorrelations of Scale Scores Grouped by Hypotheses . . . . II - 9

Figure 2 - Intercountry Chi-Square Mother Interview . . . III - 455

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT:
A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

ABSTRACT

Parental Views of Themselves and Their Children in Eight Countries

Interviews were conducted with all of the mothers and about half of the fathers of a stratified sample of school children whose achievement, motivation, occupational interests and coping styles had been assessed. The parents of eighty children participated in each of eight countries: Brazil, Mexico, England, West Germany, Italy, Yugoslavia, Japan and the United States (metropolitan Chicago and Austin, Texas). The parents were equally divided by their child's age (ten or fourteen), sex, and socioeconomic status (upper-middle or upper-working level). The systematically structured interview focused on the coping styles of the parents; their perception of their child's attitudes, achievement and coping style; and the parents' occupational lives: their interests, their work histories, their attitudes and actions on the job, and their occupational value preferences. Their beliefs about the role and value of education were also explored.

The parents' responses were coded into content-categories for each question in the interview. The frequency of each kind of response was used to describe the characteristics of parents and children within each country. A Chi-Square analysis also was performed, to permit comparisons across the eight countries. The responses of matched mothers and fathers were also compared and described, to determine the amount and kind of consistent agreement in their values, their self-descriptions and their perceptions of their child.

These data provide a cross-national comparison of adult values, coping styles, and child-rearing practices.

SECTION I

OVERVIEW

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT:
A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The University of Texas at Austin

1972

SECTION I

OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

While Stage I of the project had been concerned with testing ten- and fourteen-year-old children, Stage III was concerned with interviewing a selected sample of the parents of the children tested.

The interview was planned with more than one purpose in mind. In the first place, it was hoped that it would provide validating information for some of the Stage I data collected from the children, particularly on the projective instruments -- the Story Completion, the Sentence Completion, and the Social Attitudes Inventory. There were also some questions that related to the information given by the child on the Demographic Questionnaire and the Occupational Interest Inventory. These specific comparisons of Stage I and Stage II data will be dealt with in Volume IV.

The interview was also designed to serve a broader purpose of collecting information regarding parents' own attitudes and values and parent/child interaction as seen from the parents' point of view.

In this way the Stage II results could be related to the Stage I results in an explanatory fashion. These results also could permit a cross-cultural study of parents, alone.

The interview, then, was primarily concerned with coping behavior and the factors that influence it. Thus, most of the questions arose from a conceptual system developed during Stage I of the study, the work of a number of previous investigators was drawn on. The studies of Dave and Wolf on home environment were considered, with particular regard to Academic Task Achievement. The work of Maccoby and Levin and the Berkeley growth studies were also considered. With regard to format and question construction, the source most heavily used for initial ideas was the work of Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook. In addition, earlier studies by Hereford, Havighurst, and Peck were drawn upon.

Specific Questions

Because of their validational nature, a number of questions were phrased in a manner very similar to that used in the children's instruments. To take the projective instruments first, twelve of the Sentence Completion stems were paired with questions in the interview. The relationship with the Story Completion instrument was not so extensive but there were certain questions that could be related to certain stories.

The first fourteen questions in the interview related to demographic information and covered the same areas as the child's demographic questionnaire. The occupational interest questions included not only the parents' reports of the child's aspirations and expectations but also the parents' aspirations and expectations for the child.

These validating questions did not follow each other in strict sequence. Rather the interview was planned so that questions relating to specific areas would be dealt with together, making it easier for both parent and interviewer. Thus, the interview was divided into two main parts. Questions 1 - 88 dealt with information related either to the child or to parent/child interaction; questions 89-110 dealt with parent relevant information.

The child-centered questions were structured in the following way:

Question	Type of Information
1 - 22	Demographic
23 - 38	School oriented questions including Academic Task Achievement as well as Parent's Attitude to School
39 - 44	Child Activities including Parent/ Child Interaction
45 - 55	Nonacademic Task Achievement
56 - 62	Child's reaction to Authority
63 - 68	Nonacademic Task Achievement outside home
69 - 72	Occupational Interests
73 - 76	Interpersonal Relations
77 - 81 and 88	Anxiety
82 - 87	Aggression

In the parent centered section of the interview the questions were arranged as follows:

90 - 94	Further Education
95 - 103	Occupational Information

104 - 107 Reaction to Criticism

108 - 109 Aggression

Apart from validating aspects, it was hoped that three main types of information would be obtained. The first was coping style information, which was covered from several points of view. One was concerned with the child's actual coping style as seen by the parents, in the areas already being investigated, i.e., Task Achievement, Anxiety, Aggression, Authority, and Interpersonal Relations. Information was also obtained from the parents about their own coping styles in a variety of situations under the same area headings.

The second kind was occupational information. This was information relevant not only to occupational interests but also to occupational values. In the latter case the parents were asked to rank the fifteen occupational values to permit a direct statistical comparison with the children's data. In addition, for working parents, information was obtained about their own occupational history, attitudes and values toward their jobs and their coping behavior while working.

Third was achievement information. Questions involving Task Achievement by the child were divided into the two major areas of Academic and Nonacademic Achievement. Nonacademic Achievement related to jobs or chores in the home and for fourteen-year-old children to paid jobs outside the home. Questions concerning Academic Achievement centered primarily around homework, as this was the area of education with which parents were most familiar. Questions in these areas included not only the child's performance in the homework area but the parent's participation and support both for homework and generalized educational endeavors. In addition, the parents were asked for their evaluation of the child's performance in school.

Construction of the Interview

At the London Conference in 1966 the major responsibility for the development of the Parent Interview was assigned to Austin and London and the bulk of the construction and pilot testing took place at these two stations. The initial form of the instrument caused concern in a number of stations because of its length. It was thought that the parents would find it too tedious and that rapport would be lost. Revisions of this form were therefore carried out by both stations and agreement reached on a second version. This version was sent to all stations for translation and pilot testing. On the basis of results from all stations a shortened form of the interview was constructed and once more distributed to all stations for translation and pilot testing. This form went through two additional revisions in Austin and London before the final form was agreed on at a meeting in New York in January, 1967. This final form was sent to all countries for translation and the translated version returned to Austin and London and back,translating and checking.

The final interview form consisted of one hundred nine questions plus the ranking of the fifteen occupational values. Each value was printed on a separate card and the parents placed these in order of preference.

For the most part, the parents' responses to the questions were recorded verbatim by the interviewer. A few of the questions, such as age, for example, were pre-coded and a few of the responses were recorded along a dimension such as degree of satisfaction or importance, for example, responses to the question "How important do you think school is?" were coded as -- Most Important

Very Important
Important
Unimportant
Worthless

In these instances of coded questions, however, there was almost always a following probe so that a verbal response from the parents was also available. In the case of the example above, the probe was "Why?"

In addition to the actual questions there was a section that dealt with what were termed post-interview ratings. These dealt with dimensions of behavior that it was thought were embodied in coping style. As these dimensions were not finalized until after the interview questions were constructed there was some doubt as to whether sufficient information on the dimensions would be obtained from the actual questions. The interviewers were, therefore, asked to complete a five-point rating form for each of the dimensions in the behavior areas of Task Achievement (Academic and Nonacademic), Anxiety, and Parent/Child Interaction.

The purpose of these ratings was primarily to encourage the interviewer to get as much information as possible. If the interviewer knew that he had to make these ratings it was thought that he would be more thorough in collecting the information during the interview.

In addition to the interview form itself, a lengthy manual of instructions to interviewers was constructed. In addition to general instructions this document contained a question-by-question explanation of the purpose and intent of each question and its relationship to the coping dimensions. A copy of this manual was given to every interviewer.

When the original interview form came to be translated it was agreed that the layout could be changed to suit the needs of individual stations, though sufficient space for full recording had to be maintained. However the numbering and sequence of sections remained unchanged.

Selection of Parents

It was agreed at the London Conference to interview eighty mothers (ten per cell) and at least forty fathers (five per cell). In terms of priority, the mothers came first. To select the sample, the subjects in each cell were divided at the median of the average of the achievement scores. The sample was then randomly selected, half from either side of the median. Any refusals necessitated random replacement from the appropriate half cell. In actual fact, the number of refusals varied across stations. In London, for example, only two mothers had to be replaced, while Mexico City had 11.25% refusals and the percentage in Chicago was even higher.

Training of Interviewers

This varied from country to country, but as much time as possible was devoted to this procedure. Wherever possible, observations of practice interviews by the entire interviewing team in one-way observation rooms was carried out. Group review of practice interviews was another method used, while every interviewer carried out at least two practice interviews that were gone over with him in detail before actual interviewing of the sample commenced.

The interviewers were either project staff members or interviewers hired specifically for this purpose and given a period of training and practice with this particular interview.

The interview usually lasted from one to two hours and usually took place in the parents' home. However in some stations, Milan for example, the interview took place in the University department. Mothers and fathers were interviewed separately.

Method of Coding

The verbatim responses to the questions were coded using a system of content categories. These coding categories were developed from a sample of at least twenty-four interviews from each station. The translated responses from each station for each question were typed on small cards that were placed in empirical content categories by independent judges. The consensus of these judgments formed the content coding categories for each question. At this point a deliberate attempt was made to use as many and as fine categories as possible in order to preserve the richness of verbal response. It was felt that categories could be eliminated or collapsed later whereas it would be impossible to discriminate new categories at a later date.

Not all the coding categories were, however, empirically derived at this stage. Some of the categories from the Demographic Questionnaire were used intact and some modifications of the Sentence Completion coding categories were used to give direct comparability with the children's data.

A preliminary coding manual was developed by the Austin and London stations and sent to all stations, who then sent back their suggestions and modifications. The initial manual was revised in the light of these criticisms and the final manual was then translated by each station.

A complex system of coder training and calibration was devised to ensure comparable coding across all stations. The first step was to achieve comparability between Austin and London on a group of twelve interviews from each station. These twenty-four interviews were coded independently by at least two coders in each station, who then reached agreement within stations. The consensus results were then compared and differences discussed by letter and by telephone. When Austin and London were calibrated, i.e., interpreting the manual in exactly the same way, each of the other stations was asked to code twelve of their own interviews, using two or more coders, who then reached consensus and sent the results to Austin and London. These interviews were independently coded in both Austin and London and the results compared with the original station's coding. Differences were discussed and agreement reached. In addition there were some face-to-face meetings among subgroups of stations to discuss and improve coder reliability.

When the period of calibration was finished the production coding of the entire sample of interviews was undertaken in each station. In the production coding, each interview in each station was coded by at least two independent coders and the final code given was the consensus of these two individuals. The coders in each station were the same individuals who had gone through the calibration process with the Austin and London stations.

This elaborate and time-consuming process was designed to provide the maximum comparability and reliability of interview data from all stations. Although laborious, the use of independent coders and the calibration of these coders across stations proved successful. This method had the additional advantage of greatly reducing the possibility of clerical errors.

Analysis

Analysis of the data was of two types: 1. Descriptive analysis of the categorical data, using chi-square for (a) Mother data and (b) Mother/Father comparisons. 2. Analysis using the scaled data of the interview.

For each station, three chi-square analyses were run on the Mother data, one for Age, one for Socioeconomic Status, and one for Sex. Because the coding manual had originally aimed at fine discriminations between codes it was found, in a large number of cases, that cell frequencies were too small to fulfill the requirements of a chi-square analysis. For this reason a number of codes had to be collapsed and a complete collapsed-codes manual produced so that analyses would be possible. This process occasionally produced combinations that were not as meaningful as the separate code-categories. However, on the whole, the codes that were combined did produce meaningful new codes.

Although all stations endeavored to obtain eighty mother interviews this was not possible in some cases. However the numbers were close to this figure. It was decided that the discussion of results should be in percentage terms rather than frequencies. The outline of the chi-square mother report covered four main areas.

1. Description of the Sample
2. Child Relevant Items
3. Parent/Child Relevant Items
4. Parent Relevant Items

The writing followed a set format, with first an overall description of the frequencies regardless of Age, Socioeconomic Status, or Sex; second a discussion of the significant differences by (a) Age, (b) Socioeconomic Status,(3) Sex; and finally, a summary and interpretation section. This format was followed for each of the Age, Sex, and Status sections.

Chi-square analysis was also carried out on the Mother/Father data. Only forty fathers had been interviewed in each station so the mother sample in this analysis was exactly twice the size of the father sample. This examination of frequencies could be misleading unless this fact was kept in mind during interpretation. Only significant differences between mother and father data were discussed, the discussion following the main headings that had been used for the description of the mother data.

A correlational analysis was then carried out on the mother data using scale scores. The basic types of scales imposed on the data were (a) Coping Effectiveness ratings, (b) scaling of the various Coping Style dimensions used in scoring the children's projective data, and (c) new dimensions, created especially for the purpose of scaling given items whose content codes were not readily amenable to scaling on already existing dimensions. Some items were scaled more than once, primarily those items and their codes which were essentially identical to certain Sentence Completion stems, e.g., Stance and Coping Effectiveness could both be scaled on one item.

For the purpose of this analysis the interview questions were divided into four areas -- (a) Child Behavior, (b) Parent Behavior, (c) Parent/Child Behavior, and (d) Parent Attitude. Intercorrelations of scale scores for all questions were carried out within and across these areas but only significant correlations were discussed in the write-up.

Conclusion

In general, the interview appears to have been successful within the usual limitations of self-report measurement. The method was feasible in that all stations were able to complete their interviews within the prescriptions of the sample, the content of the interview material was related to the data collected from children in Stage I, and the coding was of sufficiently high comparability across stations to permit meaningful comparisons.

On the negative side, the process was so time consuming that the sample of parents was necessarily limited. This, in turn, limited the fineness of analysis by research design variables as the cell frequencies became too small when the sample was broken down by many dimensions. In view of the paucity of these kinds of data in cross-cultural studies,however,the results appeared to be worth the effort.

FIGURE 1

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SCALE SCORES GROUPED BY HYPOTHESES - STAGE II

TABLE 1. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic)
*Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 1-36

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Variable 16. Activity Level									Variable 17. Activity Level									Variable 21. Initiation								
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.							.23					.31							.41						-.29	.27	
Var. 7 Initiation		-.23										.25														.34	
Var. 8 Engagement																			.24		.22					.40	
Var. 4 Attitude								.25									.25									.23	
Var. 9 Persistence					.25														.29							.22	
Var. 6 Engagement																							.50			.33	
	Variable 22. Implementation									Variable 23. Coping Effectiveness									Variable 24. Initiation								
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.		.30										.24	\	-.31								-.22					
Var. 7 Initiation				.32	-.23	.26							\	-.38		.26								.34			
Var. 8 Engagement				.40			.23			.24		.31	\	-.64			.30	.25		.22				.29			
Var. 4 Attitude	.31												\		.24												
Var. 9 Persistence					.55					.40		.23	\	-.46						.34						.22	
Var. 6 Engagement					-.41								\														

TABLE 2. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic)
*Authority

Hypotheses 37-66

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Variable 19. Coping Eff. (Mother)									Variable 26. Coping Eff. (Mother)									Variable 28. Coping Eff. (Father)								
Var. 5 Cop.Eff.														.28						.26							
Var. 7 Initiation	-.24							28	.25		-.26											-.23		-.29			.36
Var. 8 Engagement										.22															.27		
Var. 4 Attitude						.29	.23											-.27		.24				.23			.23
Var. 9 Persistence																				.25					-.29		.40
Var. 6 Engagement							.36					.26															
	Variable 30. Coping Eff. (Mother)									Variable 32. Coping Eff. (Father)																	
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.										.29	.24							.24									
Var. 7 Initiation							.25																				
Var. 8 Engagement									.26																		
Var. 4 Attitude																											
Var. 9 Persistence								.28									.23										
Var. 6 Engagement																											

TABLE 3. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic)
*Interpersonal Relations

Hypotheses 67-81
and 118-120

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Variable 36. Coping Effectiveness									Variable 58. Coping Effectiveness									Variable 34. Coping Effectiveness								
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.														.25													
Var. 7 Initiation	-.22																										
Var. 8 Engagement									-.29													.25					.34
Var. 4 Attitude	.35	-22	.27																								
Var. 9 Persistence	.23																							-.28			
Var. 6 Engagement						-27	.24																				

TABLE 4. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic)
* Anxiety

Hypotheses 82-93

	Variable 41. Coping Effectiveness									Variable 42. Implementation																	
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.					.25																						
Var. 7 Initiation												-.23			-.22	-.23											
Var. 8 Engagement																											
Var. 4 Attitude		.25										-.22															
Var. 9 Persistence		.24	.23	.30								-.32	-.46		-.23												
Var. 6 Engagement		.30					.32																				

TABLE 5. Child Behavicr

Task Achievement (Academic)
*Aggression

Hypotheses 94-117

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 48. Coping Effectiveness(Mother)									Var. 51. Coping Effectiveness (F)								
Var. 5 Cop. Eff											.31									.24			.24				
Var. 7 Initiation							-.22							.23								-.34	.22				
Var. 8 Engagement		.32							.36											.34							
Var. 4 Attitude																											
Var. 9 Persistence																											
Var. 6 Engagement																											
	Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)																										
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.		.25		.26			.23		.22																		
Var. 7 Initiation	-.37			.27			.23																				
Var. 8 Engagement				[illegible]			.29																				
Var. 4 Attitude		.37																									
Var. 9 Persistence		.33			.23				.32																		
Var. 6 Engagement				.34																							

TABLE 6. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)
*Authority

Hypotheses 121-150

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 19. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 26. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 28. Coping Effectiveness (F)								
Var. 16 Activity L.											.24		-.25											-.30	-.24		
Var. 17 Activity L.													-.22					.25		-.29				.24			
Var. 21. Initiation								.30						.37						.32							
Var. 22. Implementa.		.30												-.88				.26		.30			-.45				
Var. 23 Coping Eff.				\	-.71	.22			.25	.28			\									\	.30				
Var. 24. Initiation					.22			.32		.29																	
	Var. 30. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 32. Coping Effectiveness (Father)																	
Var. 16 Activity L.	.27																										
Var. 17 Activity L.											.22																
Var. 21 Initiation					-.44	.22							-.23	-.43													
Var. 22 Implementa.					-.31									.52													
Var. 23. Coping Eff.				\	-.57						.45		\			-.28											
Var. 24. Initiation			.38								-.22																

TABLE 7. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)
* Interpersonal Relations

Hypotheses 151-168

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 36. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 58. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 34. Coping Effectiveness								
Var. 16 Activity L.																			.25								
Var. 17 Activity L.							.28											-.27						-.27	.25		
Var. 21 Initiation	.29													.35									-.91				
Var. 22 Implementa.	.24				-.31									-.75					.27								
Var. 23 Coping Eff.				\	.24			.33					\							-.24		\	-.46				.25
Var. 24 Initiation															-.25					.28							

TABLE 8. Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)
*Anxiety

Hypotheses 169-180

	Var. 41. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 42. Emplementation																	
Var. 16 Activity L.			.25																								
Var. 17 Activity L.					.28		-.27																				
Var. 21 Initiation					.48									.25													
Var. 22 Implementa.	.26				-.49				.23									.28									
Var. 23 Coping Eff.				\									\	.63	-.23												
Var. 24 Initiation									.26							-.24		-.25									

TABLE 9. Child Behavior — Task Achievement (Nonacademic) *Aggression — Hypotheses 181-204

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 48. Coping Effectiveness(Mother)									Var. 51. Coping Effectiveness (F)								
Var. 16 Activity L.									-.25		-.27		.23			.27						.28			.43		
Var. 17 Activity L.			.23								-.25									-.23							
Var. 21 Initiation					.48	.24					.30	.24	.33	.59							.24						
Var. 22 Implementa.			.23									.47	.27	-.58							.41						
Var. 23 Coping Eff.		-.33		\	.53			.23		.27	-.30	.27	\						.31			\	.46				
Var. 24 Initiation													.24				.24				-.26						
	Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)																										
Var. 16 Activity L.																											
Var. 17 Activity L.					.29																						
Var. 21 Initiation							-.30																				
Var. 22 Implementa.					-.92		-.28	.26	.28																		
Var. 23. Coping Eff.	.22			\	-.52																						
Var. 24 Initiation																											

TABLE 10 Child Behavior — Authority *Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 205-219

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 36. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 58. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 34. Coping Effectiveness								
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)	.32	-.22																									.33
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)						.24						.25		.27		.27			.24		-.22						-.22
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)												.27				.29				.25	.27						
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)							.31	.25	-.22			.28	.23									.29			.23		
Var. 32. Cop.Eff.(F)																						.48					

TABLE 11 Child Behavior — Authority *Anxiety — Hypotheses 220-229

	Var. 41. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 42. Implementation																	
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)											-.22							-.26									
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)	.22								.33				-.26		-.26												
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)					.28	.27			.32			.22	-.26		-.23			-.28									
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)															.22	-.35											
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)									.23		-.29																

TABLE 12 Child Behavior

Authority
*Aggression

Hypotheses 230-249

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 48. Coping Effectiveness (M)									Var. 51. Coping Effectiveness (F)								
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)																.26	.27									.28	-.24
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)										.23		.27		.42	.32				.24		.23	-.30			.22		
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)	-.22			-.29							.32	.33	-.36	.27		.29		-.38						.25	.31		
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)		-.23			-.25																						-.27
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)	-.23			.25				.26				-.22								.42	-.37	.25			.27		
	Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)																										
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)		.41																									
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)	.23	.26						.41	.35																		
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)							.23	.42																			
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)			.34	.23			.25																				
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)		.26					.25																				

TABLE 13 Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations
*Anxiety

Hypotheses 250-255

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy *	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 41. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 42. Implementation																	
Var. 36 Coping Eff.					.32											-.23											
Var. 58 Coping Eff.																											
Var. 34 Coping Eff.					-.23											.24											

TABLE 14 Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations
*Aggression

Hypotheses 256-267

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 48. Coping Eff. (Mother)									Var. 51. Coping Eff. (Father)								
Var. 36 Coping Eff.				-.23															.37								
Var. 58 Coping Eff.	.27				.30	.23			.46									.32	.29							.24	
Var. 34 Coping Eff.											.26											.25					
	Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)																										
Var. 36 Coping Eff.								.32	-.25																		
Var. 58 Coping Eff.						.26																					
Var. 34 Coping Eff.																											

TABLE 15 Child Behavior

Anxiety
* Aggression

Hypotheses 268-275

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 48. Coping Effectiveness(Mother)									Var. 51. Coping Effectiveness (Father)								
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.														.23													
Var. 42 Implementa.											÷25																
	Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)																										
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.																											
Var. 42 Implementa.			.22						.43																		
TABLE 16	Child's behavior * Parent Attitude									Task Achievement (Academic) * Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 276-293								
	Parental Evaluation of Var. 59. Child's Academic Task Ach.									Parental Initiation in Var. 61. Contacting School									Parental Academic Var. 66. Aspiration								
Var. 5 Cop.Eff.	.43	÷64	.55	.76	1.00				.69									.24			.23	.22		.43		.25	.24
Var. 7 Initiation								÷26													.22					.22	
Var. 8 Engagement		.34			.29																						
Var. 4 Attitude				.40					.28															.24			
Var. 9 Persistence			.30						.33	÷26																	
Var. 6 Engagement		.45				.25	.28		.27	.22	.25						÷26			.38							

TABLE 17 Child's Behavior *
Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic)*
Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 294-305

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Child's Growth Versus Var. 70. Parental Convenience									Parental Occupational Var. 71. Aspiration																	
Var. 5 Cop. Eff			÷24	╲		.33									.25												
Var. 7 Initiation			÷25	╲						÷28							÷23										
Var. 8 Engagement			÷34	╲								÷28															
Var. 4 Attitude				╲																							
Var. 9 Persistence				╲		.26																					
Var. 6 Engagement				╲																							
TABLE 18	Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude									Task Achievement (Academic)* School									Hypotheses 306-323								
	Parental Conception of Var. 63. Major Function of School									Parental Attitude Towards Var. 64. Importance of School									Parental Conception of Var. 65. Maj.. Function of School								
Var. 5 Cop.Eff.							.24								.22									÷26			
Var. 7 Initiation																					÷24						
Var. 8 Engagement													.23								÷50						
Var. 4 Attitude							.29											.32									
Var. 9 Persistence							.24			.33												÷30					
Var. 6 Engagement									÷25																		

TABLE 19 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)* Task Achievement (Academic)

Hypotheses 324-341

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Parental Evaluation of Child's Var. 59. Academic Task Achievement									Parental Initiation in Var. 61. Contacting School									Parental Academic Var. 66. Aspiration								
Var. 16 Activity L.	÷27				÷31																						
Var. 17 Activity L.			.24	.23							.25			.22		.30					.26						
Var. 21 Initiation			.29						.51					÷24							÷30	÷29					
Var. 22 Implementa.		.25			÷61					÷28		÷25							÷28		÷26	.23					-28
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.				\	÷33								\	÷54								\	.47				.22
Var. 24 Initiation		.23							.55													÷45			÷22		

TABLE 20 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)* Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 342-353

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Child's Growth Versus Var. 70. Parental Convenience									Parental Occupational Var. 71. Aspiration																	
Var. 16 Act. Level				\												.34											
Var. 17 Act. Level				\					÷26	.27	.23																
Var. 21 Initiation				\			÷24					÷24		÷33			÷28	÷25									
Var. 22 Implementa.			÷22	\									.26					÷26									
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.				\		.24						÷39	\														
Var. 24 Initiation	.28			\													÷25										

TABLE 21 Child Behavior * Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * School

Hypotheses 354-371

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Parental Conception of Var. 63. Major Function of School									Parental Attitude Towards Var. 64. Importance of School									Parental Conception of Var. 65. Major Function of School								
Var. 16 Act. Level					÷23																						
Var. 17 Act. Level																											
Var. 21 Initiation					.50																						.25
Var. 22 Implementa.					.22																		÷22				
Var. 23 Cop.Eff.				\	.72					.23	.24		\	÷25			.26			÷26		\	.37				
Var. 24 Initiation																									.29		

TABLE 22 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude

Authority * Task Achievement (Academic)

Hypotheses 372-386

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Parental Evaluation of Var. 59. Child's Aca. Task Ach.									Parental Initiation in Var. 61. Contacting School									Parental Academic Var. 66. Aspiration								
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)		.23		.28										.23				.31								.23	
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)					.27		÷33	.22	÷38		÷25				.22						.32						
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)			.59		.33						÷28			÷25				.32									
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)	÷25																										
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)			.26						.22	÷22																	

TABLE 23 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Authority * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 387-396

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Child's Browth Versus Var. 70. Parental Convenience									Parental Occupational Var. 71. Aspiration																	
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)				\			÷31					.24															
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)				\		.34		.22																			
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)				\				.27										-.33									
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)				\					÷24																		
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)				\							.27			÷28	.31		-.24										
TABLE 24	Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude									Authority * School									Hypotheses 397-411								
	Parental Conception of Var. 63. Major Function of School									Parental Attitude Towards Var. 64. Importance of School									Parental Conception of Var. 65. Major Function of School								
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)																	.27										
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)			.25										÷37														
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)							÷38				÷30				÷26		÷24				÷24						
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)			÷30																÷32								÷24
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)						÷22					.22							.35	÷22					÷29			

TABLE 25 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Interpersonal Relations* Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 412-420

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Parental Evaluation of Var. 59. Child's Aca. Task Ach.									Parental Initiation in Var. 61. Contacting School									Parental Academic Var. 66. Aspiration								
Var. 36 Cop. Eff.												÷27								.24							
Var. 58 Cop. Eff.		÷27	.39		.61			÷26	÷65								÷24										
Var. 34 Cop. Eff.	÷23		.38													.26									-.22		
TABLE 26	Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude									Interpersonal Relations* Task Achievement (Nonacademic)									Hypotheses 421-426								
	Child's Growth Versus Var. 70. Parental Convenience									Parental Occupational Var. 71. Aspiration																	
Var. 36. Cop. Eff.		.28		\						.23	.31																
Var. 58 Cop. Eff.				\																							
Var. 34 Cop. Eff.	÷24		.25	\																							
TABLE 27	Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude									Interpersonal Relations* School									Hypotheses 427-435								
	Parental Conception of Var. 63. Major Function of School									Parental Attitude Towards Var. 64. Importance of School									Parental Conception of Var. 65. Major Function of School								
Var. 36 Cop. Eff.							.25				.27														.24		.38
Var. 58 Cop. Eff.																						÷23					
Var. 34 Cop. Eff.																						.35					

TABLE 28 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Anxiety * Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 436-441

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 59. Parental Evaluation of Child's Aca. Task Ach.									Var. 61. Parental Initiation in Contacting School									Var. 66. Parental Academic Aspiration								
Var. 41 Cop. Eff.		.25							.44	÷24	.25					÷22											
Var. 42 Implementa.		.28					÷23		÷74					÷29							÷25						

TABLE 29 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Anxiety * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 442-445

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 70. Child's Growth Versus Parental Convenience									Var. 71. Parental Occupational Aspiration																	
Var. 41 Cop. Eff.				╲		.25											÷25										
Var. 42 Implementa.				╲												.22											

TABLE 30 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Anxiety * School — Hypotheses 446-451

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 63. Parental Conception of Major Function of School									Var. 64. Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School									Var. 65. Parental Conception of Major Function of School								
Var. 41 Cop. Eff.																	÷22					÷34					
Var. 42 Implementa.													.25														

TABLE 31 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Aggression * Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 452-463

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 59. Parental Evaluation of Child's Aca. Task Ach.									Var. 61. Parental Initiation in Contacting School									Var. 66. Parental Academic Aspiration								
Var. 45 Cop. Eff.		.34	.22						÷33									÷39									÷29
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)			.36																÷27							.25	
Var. 51 Cop. Eff.(F)		.39																				÷22				.29	
Var. 54(Friends) Cop. Eff.			.28						÷70																÷37		

TABLE 32 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude — Aggression * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 464-471

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 70. Child's Growth Versus Parental Convenience									Var. 71. Parental Occupational Aspiration																	
Var. 45 Cop. Eff.				╲											.22												
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)				╲				÷29	.22		÷36																
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)				╲												.22											
Var. 54 C.E.(Friends)				╲																							

TABLE 33 Child's Behavior * Parent Attitude

Aggression * School

Hypotheses 472-483

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Parental Conception of Var. 63. Major Function of School									Parental Attitude Towards Var. 64. Importance of School									Parental Conception of Var. 65. Major Function of School								
Var. 45 Cop.Eff.																						.32					
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)							-.23															.37					
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)							-.36															.23					.33
Var. 54 Cop.Eff.(Friends)																				.24							
TABLE 34	Child's Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Task Achievement (Academic)* Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 484-495								
	Parental Implementation Var. 60. in Schoolwork									Parental Implementation Var. 62. in Homework																	
Var. 5 Cop. Eff.		-.24	-.27									-.27	-.36			-.29											
Var. 6 Engagement												-.30	-.35			-.24	-.29										
Var. 7 Initiation	-.43			-.25					.25	-.54	-.24	-.39	-.49		-.38		-.31										
Var. 8 Engagement								-.23			-.26	-.33	-.33			-.28	-.37										
Var. 4 Attitude	-.23				-.31								-.26		-.32												
Var. 9 Persistence																											

TABLE 35 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic)* Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 496-507

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Parental Directedness in Var. 67.Task Ach.(Nonacademic)									Degree of Guidance Var. 69. by Parents																	
Var 5 Cop.Eff.								-.26		.22					.27												
Var. 6 Engagement																											
Var. 7 Initiation									-.25	.33					.46												
Var. 8 Engagement										.34																	
Var. 4 Attitude						-.23					-.24							.23									
Var. 9 Persistence		-.23					.22	-.33										.42									
TABLE 36	Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Task Achievement (Academic)* Interpersonal Relations									Hypotheses 508-537								
	Activity Level Var. 13. Mother/Child Interaction									Activity Level Var. 15. Father/Child Interaction									Positive Affect Var. 12. Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 5 Cop.Eff.						.28									.22			.25							.28		
Var. 6 Engagement															.22	-.25								.25			
Var. 7 Initiation																				.25				.27			
Var. 8 Engagement						.33				.24											.32			.38			
Var. 4 Attitude																									.26	.34	
Var. 9 Persistence						.26																		.35			.29
	Positive Affect Var. 14. Father/Child Interaction									Degree of Guidance by Var. 74. Parent																	
Var. 5 Cop.Eff.	.35					.28		.30				.30	\														
Var. 6 Engagement						.31							\					.25									
Var. 7 Initiation													\														
Var. 8 Engagement													\														
Var. 4 Attitude													\														
Var. 9 Persistence		.44						.33		-.29			\					.23									

TABLE 37 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Academic) * Anxiety — Hypotheses 538-543

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 75. Degree of Guidance by Parent																										
Var. 5 Cop.Eff.					.30																						
Var. 6 Engagement				.24																							
Var. 7 Initiation					-.32																						
Var. 8 Engagement									.30																		
Var. 4 Attitude			.25																								
Var. 9 Persistence									-.36																		

TABLE 38 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 544-555

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60. Parental Implementation in Schoolwork									Var. 62. Parental Implementation in Homework																	
Var. 16 Activity L.																											
Var. 17 Activity L.		.24		.22									.22														
Var. 21 Initiation					-.24							-.22		.32													
Var. 22 Implementation					.31																						
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.				╲									╲	.37		-.25											
Var. 24 Initiation																											

TABLE 39 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 556-567

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 67. Parental Directedness in Task Ach. (Nonacademic)									Var. 69. Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 16 Activity L.																											
Var. 17 Activity L.		-.26														-.27											
Var. 21 Initiation				-.24							-.22			-.29		.22											
Var. 22 Implementa.							-.24										.30										
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.				╲	.57				-.31		-.28		╲	-.66													
Var. 24 Initiation				-.25																							

TABLE 40 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 568-597

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 13. Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15. Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12. Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 16 Activity L.																		.34				-.39					
Var. 17 Activity L.						.22				.30																	
Var. 21 Initiation	.31		.22		-.52					.26				-.23				-.28	.35		.22		-.25				
Var. 22 Implementa.					.49											-.29				.28							
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.				╲	-.31							.23	╲	-.45		-.25						╲	.38				
Var. 24 Initiation						.22									.24									.23	.25		
	Var. 14. Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74. Degree of Guidance by Parent																	
Var. 16 Activity L.	.24						.27			.25	.30		╲														
Var. 17 Activity L.						.43		.22			.24		╲			.38											
Var. 21 Initiation					-.35					-.29			╲	-.35													
Var. 22 Implementa.					-.29					-.26			╲	.23													
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.				╲	-.28								╲	-.32													
Var. 24 Initiation				-.25	.22					-.39			╲														

TABLE 41 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child | Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Anxiety | Hypotheses 598-602

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 75. Degree of Guidance by Parent																										
Var. 16 Activity L.																											
Var. 17 Activity L.					.23																						
Var. 21 Initiation			÷26	.29																							
Var. 22 Implementa.					.25																						
Var. 23 Cop. Eff.					.37			÷23																			
Var. 24 Initiation																											

TABLE 42 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child | Authority * Task Achievement (Academic) | Hypotheses 603-612

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60. Parental Implementation in Schoolwork									Var. 62. Parental Implementation in Homework																	
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)																	÷25										
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)																											
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)																.27	.23										
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)														÷24													
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)																											

TABLE 43 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child | Authority * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) | Hypotheses 613-622

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 67. Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonaca.)									Var. 69. Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)																											
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)									.36																		
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)	.22									.25																	
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)								÷22								÷22											
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)								÷22				.28					.23	.33									

TABLE 44 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child | Authority * Interpersonal Relations | Hypotheses 623-647

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 13. Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15. Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12. Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)																			.27								
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)									.32																.28		
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)	÷26								.34									.30								.28	.27
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)												.33									.29						
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)						÷26					.26										.22						
	Var. 14. Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74. Degree of Guidance by Parent																	
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)													\														
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)			.28		.22								\			÷22											
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)									.36				\			÷24											
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)											.27		\			÷26											
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)													\														

TABLE 45 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Authority * Anxiety — Hypotheses 648-652

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Degree of Guidance Var. 75. by Parent																										
Var. 19 Cop.Eff.(M)	÷37								.24																		
Var. 26 Cop.Eff.(M)									.25																		
Var. 28 Cop.Eff.(F)																											
Var. 30 Cop.Eff.(M)																											
Var. 32 Cop.Eff.(F)																											
TABLE 46	Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 653-658								
	Parental Implementation Var. 60. in Schoolwork									Parental Implementation Var. 62. in Homework																	
Var. 36 Cop.Eff.																											
Var. 58 Cop.Eff.			.22											.26													
Var. 34 Cop.Eff.																											
TABLE 47	Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)									Hypotheses 659-664								
	Parental Directedness in Var. 67. Task Achievement (Nonaca.)									Degree of Guidance Var. 69. by Parents																	
Var. 36 Cop.Eff.										÷23																	
Var. 58 Cop.Eff.								÷26	÷25																		
Var. 34 Cop.Eff.					÷23								÷22			-.26											

TABLE 48 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Interpersonal Relations * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 665-679

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Activity Level Var. 13. Mother/Child Interaction									Activity Level Var. 15. Father/Child Interaction									Positive Affect Var. 12. Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 36 Cop.Eff.										.22																	
Var. 58 Cop.Eff.														.33									.25	÷26			
Var. 34 Cop.Eff.																.25								÷22			
	Positive Affect Var. 14. Father/Child Interaction									Degree of Guidance Var. 74. by Parent																	
Var. 36 Cop.Eff.	.23						.24						\														
Var. 58 Cop.Eff.		÷33			.25		.23						\	÷23													
Var. 34 Cop.Eff.													\														
TABLE 49	Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Interpersonal Relations * Anxiety									Hypotheses 680-682								
Var.	Degree of Guidance Var. 75. by Parent																										
Var. 36 Cop.Eff.								÷27																			
Var. 58 Cop.Eff.									÷27																		
Var. 34 Cop.Eff.					.22	÷24	÷39																				

TABLE 50 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Anxiety * Task Achievement (Academic)

Hypotheses 683-686

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60. Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62. Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.																											
Var. 42 Implementa.									÷28																		

TABLE 51 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Anxiety * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 687-690

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 67. Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonaca.)									Var. 69. Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.																	.29										
Var. 42 Implementa.																											

TABLE 52 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Anxiety * Interpersonal Relations

Hypotheses 691-700

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 13. Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15. Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12. Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.		.30												.27				÷23									.32
Var. 42 Implementa.		÷34	÷23														÷22										÷33
	Var. 14. Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74. Degree of Guidance by Parent																	
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.					25								\														
Var. 42 Implementa.			÷29					÷22					\														

TABLE 53 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Anxiety * Anxiety

Hypotheses 701-702

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 75. Degree of Guidance by Parent																										
Var. 41 Cop.Eff.	.28																										
Var. 42 Implementa.			÷31	÷24			÷27		÷37																		

TABLE 54 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Aggression * Task Achievement (Academic)

Hypotheses 703-710

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60. Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62. Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 45 Cop.Eff.	÷31				÷31				÷33																		
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)																											
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)	÷22										÷35																
Var. 54 Cop.Eff.(Friends)												.23			.22												

TABLE 55 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Aggression * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 711-718

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 67. Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonaca.)									Var. 69. Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 45 Cop.Eff.						÷40																					
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)				÷23																							
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)	.23	.29									÷25																
Var. 54 Cop.Eff.(Friends)																											

TABLE 56 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Aggression * Interpersonal Relations

Hypotheses 719-738

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Activity Level Var. 13. Mother/Child Interaction									Activity Level Var. 15. Father/Child Interaction									Positive Affect Var. 12. Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 45 Cop.Eff.												.30						÷23						÷24	.23		
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)																									.31		
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)																		÷24				÷24					
Var. 54 Cop.Eff.(Friends)													.23														
	Positive Affect Var. 14. Father/Child Interaction									Degree of Guidance Var. 74. by Parents																	
Var. 45 Cop.Eff.				÷23					÷26				╲														
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)													╲														
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)													╲														
Var. 54 Cop.Eff.(Friends)													╲														

TABLE 57 Child Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child

Aggression * Anxiety

Hypotheses 739-742

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Degree of Guidance Var. 75. by Parents																										
Var. 45 Cop.Eff.																											
Var. 48 Cop.Eff.(M)																											
Var. 51 Cop.Eff.(F)																											
Var. 54 Cop.Eff.(Friends)	÷24							÷22	÷32																		

TABLE 58 **Parent Behavior * Child Behavior**

Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Academic)

Hypotheses 743-766

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 5. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 7. Initiation									Var. 8. Engagement								
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.		÷24	.29	╲		.32							╲									╲					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲	.25								╲			÷26						╲				÷22	.37
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				╲	.31	.31					÷23		╲	.22							÷27	╲					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)																	÷24	.29					.33				
	Var. 4. Attitude									Var. 9. Persistence									Var. 6. Engagement								
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲									╲									╲					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲			÷23						╲									╲					.25
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				╲									╲								÷22	╲					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)							÷22						÷28				.23										

TABLE 59 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 767-790

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 16. Activity Level									Var. 17. Activity Level									Var. 21. Initiation								
Var. 85 Cop Eff.				\			.31	.39					\									\					.27
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)	.31		.22	\						.30			\									\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\					.31				\									\	.41				
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)							.31	.22		.23							.31						÷47				
	Var. 22. Implementation									Var. 23. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 24. Initiation								
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\									\									\				.31	
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\	.35								\					.28				\			÷24		.22
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\									\	.92						÷31		\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)													\				.26									.27	

TABLE 60 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Interpersonal Relations * Authority — Hypotheses 791-810

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 19. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 26. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 28. Coping Effectiveness (Father)								
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\									\					.26	.26			\					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\									\									\	.23				.52
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)		÷24		\									\					.31				\					.23
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)		÷23															.27						.24				
	Var. 30. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 32. Coping Effectiveness (Father)																	
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.			.23	\									\		.22							\					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\									\	.22		.22						\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\		.25							\									\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)							÷24						.38				.25										

TABLE 61 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Interpersonal Relations * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 811-822

Var. 36. Coping Effectiveness	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

Var. 58. Coping Effectiveness	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.	.31			\					.30
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)	.29			\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

Var. 34. Coping Effectiveness	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\				.26	
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

TABLE 62 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Interpersonal Relations * Anxiety — Hypotheses 823-830

Var. 41. Coping Effectiveness	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.			-.22	\					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\					.25
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

Var. 42. Implementation	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\		-.24			
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\				-.25	-.26
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)	-.40								

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.									
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)									
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)									
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

TABLE 63 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Interpersonal Relations * Aggression — Hypotheses 831-846

Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\					
Var. 89 Cop.Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\					-.39
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

Var. 48. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\					
Var. 89 Cop.Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)							.27	.35	

Var. 51. Coping Effectiveness (Father)	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\					
Var. 89 Cop.Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)		.32		\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)							.33		

Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\			-.23		
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)			-.22	\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

TABLE 64 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Aggression * Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 847-852

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 5. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 7. Initiation									Var. 8. Engagement								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\									\									\					.25
	Var. 4. Attitude									Var. 9. Persistence									Var. 6. Engagement								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\									\									\					

TABLE 65 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Aggression * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 853-858

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 16. Activity Level									Var. 17. Activity Level									Var. 21. Initiation								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.		-.35		\			.37			-.34			\				.23					\	.27				
	Var. 22. Implementation									Var. 23. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 24. Initiation								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.			.23	\						.30			\									\					

TABLE 66 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Aggression * Authority — Hypotheses 859-863

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 19. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 26. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 28. Coping Effectiveness (Father)								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\								.25	\					.33	-.33			\					
	Var. 30. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 32. Coping Effectiveness (Father)																	
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.			.22	\		.31					-.23		\														

TABLE 67 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Aggression * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 864-866

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 36. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 58. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 34. Coping Effectiveness								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\			.29						\									\		.29			.31

TABLE 68 Parent Behavior * Child Behavior — Aggression * Anxiety — Hypotheses 867-868

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 41. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 42. Implementation																	
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\		-.30			.28				\					.23									

TABLE 69 Parent Behavior Child Behavior — Aggression * Aggression — Hypotheses 869-872

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 45. Coping Effectiveness									Var. 48. Coping Effectiveness (Mother)									Var. 51. Coping Effectiveness (Father)								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\				.29	.27				\									\			.24		
	Var. 54. Coping Effectiveness (Friends)																										
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.		.28		\																							

TABLE 70 Parent Behavior — Interpersonal Relations * Aggression — Hypotheses 873-876

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 101. Coping Effectiveness																										
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲			.28																				
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲																							
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				╲	.22				.24																		
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)				╲																							
TABLE 71	Parent Behavior * Parent Attitude									Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 877-888								
	Var. 59. Parental Evaluation of Child's Aca. Task Ach.									Var. 61. Parental Initiation in Contacting School									Var. 66. Parental Academic Aspiration								
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲	.29								╲									╲		.32	.34		
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲					.42				╲				.28	.22				╲		.28	.35		
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)		÷27		╲					.47				╲									╲		.38			.23
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)			÷30		.26								╲												.42		

TABLE 72 Parent Behavior * Parent Attitude — Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 889-896

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 70. Child's Growth Versus Parental Convenience									Var. 71. Parental Occupational Aspiration																	
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲		.25							╲		.32		÷24										
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)	.31			╲				.23					╲		.23												
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)			.33	╲								.24	╲		.37	.27											
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)				╲										÷23													
TABLE 73	Parent Behavior * Parent Attitude									Interpersonal Relations * School									Hypotheses 897-908								
	Var. 63. Parental Conception of Major Function of School									Var. 64. Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School									Var. 65. Parental Conception of Major Function of School								
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲								÷25	╲									╲					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲									╲									╲					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)		÷27		╲	.24								╲		.30							╲					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)													÷30	.23											÷24		

TABLE 74 Parent Behavior * Parent Attitude — Aggression * Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 909-911

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 59. Parental Evaluation of Child's Aca. Task Ach.									Var. 61. Parental Initiation In Contacting School									Var. 66. Parental Academic Aspiration								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				╲		.27							╲									╲					
TABLE 75	Parent Behavior * Parent Attitude									Aggression * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)									Hypotheses 912-913								
	Var. 70. Child's Growth Versus Parental Convenience									Var. 71. Parental Occupational Aspiration																	
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.	.25			╲									╲														
TABLE 76	Parent Behavior * Parent Attitude									Aggression * School									Hypotheses 914-916								
	Var. 63. Parental Conception of Major Function of School									Var. 64. Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School									Var. 65. Parental Conception of Major Function of School								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				╲									╲							.23		╲					
TABLE 77	Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 917-924								
	Var. 60. Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62. Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲									╲					.24									
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲				.24					╲														
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				╲									╲														
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)	.23														-.36												

TABLE 78 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Interpersonal Relations * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 925 932

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 67 Parental Directedness in Task Achievement(Nonaca.)									Var. 69. Degree of Guidance By Parents																	
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				╲							.24		╲	.33	.27												
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				╲						.37	.25	.25	╲		.24												
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				╲								.26	╲	.24													
Var. 97 Cop.Eff. (Children)										.24																	
TABLE 79	Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child									Interpersonal Relations * Interpersonal Relations									Hypotheses 933-952								
	Var. 13 Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15 Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12 Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 85 Cop.Eff.			.25	╲			-.27						╲		.23							╲			.24		
Var. 89 Cop.Eff. (Husband)				╲									╲				-.28					╲					
Var. 93 Cop.Eff. (Friends)				╲									╲					.31	-.26			╲					
Var. 97 Cop.Eff. (Children)																							.28		.26		

TABLE 79 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Interpersonal Relations * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 933-952
(Continued)

	Var. 74 Degree of Parental Guidance									Var. 14 Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction								
	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.		.24		\									\			.33		
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\									\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\							÷24		\					
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)							.34									.25		

TABLE 80 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Interpersonal Relations * Anxiety — Hypotheses 953-956

	Var. 75 Degree of Parental Guidance								
	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
Var. 85 Cop. Eff.				\					
Var. 89 Cop. Eff. (Husband)				\					
Var. 93 Cop. Eff. (Friends)				\				÷25	
Var. 97 Cop. Eff. (Children)									

TABLE 81 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Aggression * Task Achievement (Academic) — Hypotheses 957-958

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60 Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62 Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\									\														

TABLE 82 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Aggression * Task Achievement (Nonacademic) — Hypotheses 959-960

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 67 Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (NonAca.)									Var 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\									\			÷22											

TABLE 83 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Aggression * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 961-965

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 13 Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15 Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12 Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\						÷28			\							.25		\					.22
	Var. 14 Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74 Degree of Guidance By Parents																	
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.				\			.25						\														

TABLE 84 Parent Behavior * Parent Treatment of Child — Aggression * Anxiety — Hypothesis 966

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 75 Degree of Guidance by Parents																										
Var. 101 Cop. Eff.	÷22			\																							

TABLE 85 Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) *
Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 967-972

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 70 Child's Growth Versus Parental Convenience									Var. 71 Parental Occupational Aspiration																	
Var. 59 Parental Eval. of Child's Aca. Task Ach.				\					.74			÷25						÷45									
Var. 61 Parental Initiation in Contacting School				\																							
Var. 66 Parental Aca. Aspiration				\						.57	.29	.27	.30	.32	.65	.22											

TABLE 86 Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) *
School

Hypotheses 973-981

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 63 Parental Conception of Major Function of School									Var. 64 Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School									Var. 65 Parental Conception of Major Function of School								
Var. 59 Parental E.of C.A. Task Ach.	.28			\									\	.26				.48			÷36	\				.23	
Var. 61 Parental Ini. In Cont.Schl.				\									\									\		÷29		÷35	
Var. 66 Parental Aca. Aspir.				\							.37		\		.23							\		÷25	÷29		

TABLE 87 Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)*
School

Hypotheses 982-987

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 63 Parental Conception of Major Function of School									Var. 64 Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School									Var. 65 Parental Conception of Major Function of School								
Var. 70 Child's Growth vs. P. Conv.				\									\									\					
Var. 71 Parental Occ.Aspir.							.24				.40		.22											÷22			

TABLE 88 Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic)*
Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 988-991

	Var. 67 Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (NonAca.)									Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 60 Parental Imple.of Schl.wk.						.22										÷22											
Var. 62 Parental Imple.of Home wk.													÷22		÷28												

TABLE 89 Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic)*
Interpersonal Relations

Hypotheses 992-1001

	Var. 13 Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15 Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12 Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 60 P.Imple.of Schoolwork						.26			.23															.27			
Var. 62 P.Imple.of Homework								30																	÷25		

TABLE 89 (continued) Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Academic) * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 992-1001

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 74 Degree of Parental Guidance									Var. 15 Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction																	
Var. 60 P.Imple.of Schoolwork				\											.23												
Var. 62 P.Imple.of Homework				\																							

TABLE 90 Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Academic) * Anxiety — Hypotheses 1002-1003

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 75 Degree of Guidance By Parents																										
Var. 60 Parental Dir. in TA (NonAca.)								.29	.22																		
Var. 62 Degree of Guidance by Parents																											

TABLE 91 Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Interpersonal Relations — Hypotheses 1004-1013

	Var. 13 Activity Level Mother Child Interaction									Var. 15 Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12 Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 67 Parental Dir.in TA (Nonaca.)										÷22							÷22				÷28						
Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents							.23								.27						.22						
	Var. 14 Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 67 Parental Dir.in TA (Nonaca.)								÷36					\														
Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents										.23			\														

TABLE 92 Parent Treatment of Child — Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Anxiety — Hypotheses 1014-1015

	Var. 75 - Degree of Guidance by Parents																										
Var. 67 Parental Dir.in TA (Nonaca.)																											
Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents																											

TABLE 93 Parent Treatment of Child — Interpersonal Relations * Anxiety — Hypotheses 1016-1020

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 75 Degree of Guidance by Parents																										
Var. 13 Act.Level Mother/C Interact.																											
Var. 15 Act.Level F/C Interact.							÷23																				
Var. 12 Posi.Aff. M/C Interact.																											
Var. 14 Posi.Aff. F/C Interact.		.23																									
Var. 74 Degree of Parental Guidance	.23	÷28		\																							

TABLE 94 Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) * Task Achievement (Academic)

Hypotheses 1021-1026

	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60 Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62 Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 59 Parental Eval. of Child's Aca. Task Ach.										-.22	-.32			.23				-.32									
Var. 61 P. Initia. in Contact. School				╲	.28								╲														
Var. 66 P. Aca. Aspira.																											

TABLE 95 Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)

Hypotheses 1027-1032

	Var. 67 Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonaca.)									Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 59 P.Eval. of Child's Aca. Task Ach.			.32			-.24						.26	.45		-.23												
Var. 61 P. Initia. in Contact. School				╲									╲														
Var. 66 P. Aca. Aspira.			-.23															.30									

TABLE 96 Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) * Interpersonal Relations

Hypotheses 1033-1047

	Var. 13 Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15 Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12 Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 59 P.Eval. of Child's Aca. Task Ach.	.26								.29				-.26	.22				.49			.25			.38		-.27	.39
Var. 61 P. Initia. in Contact. School				╲		.24							╲							.22		╲					
Var. 66 Parental Aca. Aspir.																		.30									
	Var. 14 Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 59 P.Eval. of Child's Aca. Task Ach.		.22			.30				.39			.35	╲														
Var. 61 P. Initia. in Contact. School				╲					.30	.35			╲														
Var. 66 Parental Aca. Aspir.								.35	.32																		

TABLE 97 Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) * Anxiety

Hypotheses 1048-1050

	Var. 75 Degree of Guidance by Parents																										
Var. 59 P. Eval. of Child's Aca. Task Ach.																											
Var. 61 P. Initia. in Contact. School				╲																							
Var. 66 Parental Aca. Aspir.																											

TABLE 98	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 1051-1054								
	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60 Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62 Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 70 Child's Growth VS P.Conv.			.28	\								.36	\														
Var. 71 P. Occ. Aspira.			.22					∓27		.22	∓23																
TABLE 99	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)									Hypotheses 1055-1058								
	Var. 67 Parental Directedness in Task Ach. (Nonaca.)									Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 70 Child's Growth vs P. Conv.	∓28			\				∓25		.23			\			∓34	.26										
Var. 71 P. Occ.: Aspira.							.23								.24												
TABLE 100	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Interpersonal Relations									Hypotheses 1059-1068								
	Activity Level Var. 13 Mother/Child Interaction									Activity Level Var. 15 Father/Child Interaction									Positive Affect Var. 12 Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 70 Child's Growth vs P. Conv.				\									\									\					
Var. 71 P. Occ. Aspira.					.30									.31				.25			∓27				∓31		
	Positive Affect Var. 14 Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 70 Child's Growth vs P. Conv.	.22			\				.30		.33			\														
Var. 71 P. Occ. Aspira.					.29								\														
TABLE 101	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									Task Achievement (Nonacademic) * Anxiety									Hypotheses 1069-1070								
	Var. 75 Degree of Guidance by Parents																										
Var. 70 Child's Growth vs P. Conv.				\																							
Var. 71 P. Occ. Aspira.				∓27																							

TABLE 102	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									School * Task Achievement (Academic)									Hypotheses 1071-1076								
	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Itely	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan	Brazil	Mexico	England	Germany	Italy	Yugoslav.	Chicago	Austin	Japan
	Var. 60 Parental Implementation of Schoolwork									Var. 62. Parental Implementation of Homework																	
Var. 63 P.Concept. of Major Function of School														.32													
Var. 64 P.Att. Tow. Imp.of Sch.	-.28								.39																		
Var. 65 P Concept. of Major Function of School							-.24			.23																	

TABLE 103	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									School * Task Achievement (Nonacademic)									Hypotheses 1077-1082								
	Var. 67 Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonaca.)									Var. 69 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 63 P. Concept. of Major Function of School																											
Var. 64 P.Att. Tow. Imp.of Sch.														-.24			-.23	.34									
Var. 65 P.Concept. of Major Function of School		.24												-.26													

TABLE 104	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment									School * Interpersonal Relations									Hypotheses 1083-1097								
	Var. 13 Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction									Var. 15 Activity Level Father/Child Interaction									Var. 12 Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction								
Var. 63 P.Concept. of Maj.Funct. of School				-.24																							
Var. 64 P.Att.Towds. Imp. of Sch.						.22							-.32														
Var. 65 P.Concept. of Maj.Funct. of School															-.23						-.24						
	Var. 14 Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction									Var. 74 Degree of Guidance by Parents																	
Var. 63 P.Concept. of Maj.Funct. of School													╲														
Var. 64 P.Att.Towds. Imp.of Sch.						.24							╲														
Var. 65 P. Concept. of Maj.Funct. of School													╲														

TABLE 105	Parent Attitude * Parent Treatment of Child									School * Anxiety									Hypotheses 1098-1100								
	Var. 75 Degree of Guidance by Parents																										
Var. 63 P.Concept. of Maj.Funct. of School									.28																		
Var. 64 P.Att.Towd. Imp.of School									.22																		
Var. 65 P.Concept. of Maj.Funct. of School									-.23																		

SECTION II

FINDINGS: INTRACOUNTRY REPORTS

COPING STYLES AND ACHIEVEMENT:
A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The University of Texas at Austin

1972

FINDINGS: INTRACOUNTRY REPORTS

BRAZIL

INTRODUCTION

Procedure

The data collecting concerning the interviews with parents was carried out in 1967.

The sample of parents was chosen as follows: 1. Each subject of the eight groups was classified as an over- or under-achiever, taking into consideration the group Achievement score mean. 2. In each group, five subjects were randomly selected from each of the two Achievement subgroups: the subgroups of the higher and of the lower scores. 3. These subjects' parents constituted the parents' sample. 4. The whole sample of mothers (eighty), but only forty fathers, were interviewed. 5. For each group, besides the ten homes selected for doing the interviews, some additional ones were selected for eventual use to replace the ones previously selected, if necessary.

In order to contact the parents, the schools provided the subjects' addresses. The first contact with the parents occurred either by personal contact, by telephone or by school arrangements of the interview.

The living areas of the families were in accord with their social class, that is, the upper middle families were living in the most pleasant and residential areas of the town and the upper-lower in the industrial and surrounding areas.

It was not possible to interview four percent of the parents first chosen. These few parents agreed to be interviewed but, as they had too many social or business appointments, they did not have any time for the interview. In these cases, after three trials, they were dropped from the sample. Other missing subjects (about four percent) occurred in cases of families moving out of the city or who had adresses unknown at the school.

Generally speaking, it is possible to say that the parents' attitude toward the interview was good and relaxed, but mothers seemed to be more cooperative than fathers.

Almost all the studies and research accomplished in Brazil in the fields of psychology and education are made through standardized tests; so there are only a few using the technique of interviewing. This happens because Brazilian researchers usually work alone, or with one or two collaborators. Also, there is no great financial support, in Brazil, for research in behavioral sciences. Therefore, due to lack of staff help, collective techniques are easier to use than individual ones.

Some few researches using this method (Willems, 1953; Maynard Araujo, 1955; Castaldi, 1956; Hutchinson, 1957; Gouveia, 1957; Angelini and Rosen, 1964; Ginsberg, 1964; Aguirre, 1965) do not make explicit references to any special difficulties when they contacted the parents in order to interview them. Therefore, we concluded that if any difficulty appeared, it was probably not great.

The staff of interviewers was made up of four instructors of psychology and two psychology students (last year). Four interviewers were female and two were male. Male interviewers talked with the fathers and females with the mothers.

Before starting the work, the staff studied the interview manual, the items of the interview and performed some interviews for training (four) with parents not included in the sample. After each interview used as training, they discussed the problems that had emerged and made an evaluation of the interview, in order to improve their performance in the interviews with the actual sample.

Methodology

There was no mention in the Brazilian Psychological Reviews of any studies that have obtained this sort of information by this method.

Some researches carried out in Brazil which have produced information relevant to the questions and findings associated with the Cross-National Interview are summarized below according to the topics indicated.

1. Studies of child-rearing practices which report on such topics as child discipline or changes in child-rearing practices, et cetera.

Angelini and Rosen (1964) examined the differences and similarities among three Brazilian cities -- Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Americana; and between two countries, Brazil and the United States, in independence training through an interview with the mothers. In relation to independence training, five questions from the Winterbottom questionnaire were posed to the mothers:

- To be active and energetic in climbing, jumping and sports.
- To try hard things for himself without asking for help.
- To make his own friends among children his own age.
- To have interests and hobbies of his own. To be able to entertain himself.
- To make decisions like choosing his clothes or deciding how to spend his money by himself.

The mothers had to indicate the approximate age by which they thought their children should have learned the behavior described in each question. The results obtained showed that independence training is given earlier in the United States than in any Brazilian city. As far as Brazil is concerned, this training is given earlier in larger cities like Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro than in smaller towns like Americana. No significant differences were found related to social class.

2. Studies of family influence on child behavior with particular reference to the extended family structure.

A study using McClelland's projective technique (Angelini, 1967) studied the relation between family structure and achievement motivation. A comparison between the intensity of children's achievement motivation and size of their families indicated that the larger the size of the family, the weaker the achievement motive. Concerning birth order, the results showed that achievement motivation was higher for the single child, followed by the first child, the child in the middle position and, last, the younger child.

3. Studies of parent-child relationships

a. Pierson (1954) verified that in Brazilian rural communities there is a parent-child continuous dependence, often until adulthood. Sometimes grown-up children, even after they got married, stayed in their parents' home and continued to depend morally and economically on them. Parents tended to be indulgent toward their children; in some cases the child received such good treatment that he became dependent to a high degree upon his parents.

b. According to IBOPE data (apud Pfromm Netto, 1968), among young people living in Rio de Janeiro, with ages ranging between fourteen and twenty-five years old, emancipation occurred around twenty years old. Nevertheless, for almost half of them, to be emancipated did not mean living by themselves or earning their own money.

c. A high percentage of young people did not include leaving the parents' home in their concept of emancipation (Mugiatti, 1966).

4. a. Ginsberg (1947) investigated the factors that influence social acceptance and rejection among children and adolescents between six and twenty years of age, attending public schools in Salvador (Bahia State, Brazil). Generally, subjects mentioned the following reasons for seating near some classmates at school: friendship and personal choice, good classroom behavior, good school achievement and, less frequently, prior relationships among families. As far as skin color of the student was concerned, a slight tendency was found for the subjects to choose as friends classmates with their same skin color; this tendency increased with age.

b. Bicudo (1953-1954) studied 4,520 students from nine to fifteen years of age in Sao Paulo. They answered a questionnaire about acceptance--rejection between them and their classmates. This research found a positive correlation between the skin color of the student who rejected and the skin color of the student rejected, but racial prejudice appeared explicitly in only twenty-two percent of justifications for the rejections. Kindness, good behavior, good school achievement and friendship were the motives more frequently mentioned by the students. There were some differences when they were grouped according to sex; kindness was more frequently cited by girls, whereas friendship and good school achievement were more appreciated by boys. Among the causes for rejection, to be a bad student (including to be talkative, lazy, or to copy the lessons from their classmates) was the strongest one, appearing with a higher percentage in the justifications given by the boys.

c. In a study carried out by Brandao (1963) as in the ones mentioned above, among the personality traits which contributed to popularity, being a good friend was frequently mentioned by children and adolescents. Nevertheless, adolescents attributed more importance to "good behavior" in contrast to "misbehavior." On the other hand, "to be a bully" appeared as justification for rejecting a classmate with a higher frequency in the child group than in the adolescent group.

5. Studies of parent involvement in the school community.

Parent's opinion about the teaching of elementary school children was surveyed by Gouveia (1957) in some towns of Rio de Janeiro State. The opinions of 214 parents about the more important aims of school were fairly distributed. The higher percentages were for character formation (twenty-seven percent) and learning to read, write and count (twenty-six percent). According to parents' residence (rural or urban) education level and salary, the expectations in relation to school varied. To learn to read, to write and training for an occupation were more important for rural parents. Character formation and citizen responsibility were more prized by parents living in the city, and of higher educational and salary level. Almost half of the parents said that the schools were fair or good, but censured eagerly certain aspects such as short hours of school, long vacations, overcharged curricula, inappropriate buildings and absence of the teachers. Forty percent considered the school good. The remaining ones were less pleased; they accused school and teachers of failure, making the government responsible for the situation.

It was also observed that the higher the educational level of the parents, the more severe was their judgment of the school.

6. Studies of long or short-term parental aims for children.

In the previously cited research, Angelini and Rosen (1964) studied also parental aims for children. In this research, mother's level of occupational aspiration was rated by the number of occupations chosen by the mother among eight occupations representing six categories of social status. Surprising similarities were found between Brazil and the United States, and among Brazilian cities. Significant differences were found in relation to social class; mothers from the upper classes aspired to occupations of higher social prestige for their children than did lower class mothers.

References

Aguirre, M. J. B. F. *Significado de alguns fatores psicologicos no rendimento da leitura*, Unpublished Thesis, Universidade de Sao Paulo, 1965.

Angelini, A. L. and Rosen, B. C. Motivaçao, Aspiraçao Profissional e Alguns Aspectos da Educaçao dos Filhos: Estudo Comparativo de dados obtidos no Brasil e nos Estados Unidos, *Pesquisa e Planejamento*, 7, 1964.

Angelini, H. R. C. Estrutura da Familia e Motivo de Realizaçao, *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia*, I, 2, 1967.

Bicudo, V. L. Relaçoes raciais entre negros e blancos em Sao Paulo, *Anhembi*, XII, XIII, 1953-1954.

Brandao, G. *Sociologia da Educaçao*. Sao Paulo: Editora do Brasil, 1963.

Castaldi, C. O Demonio no Catule, *Anhembi*, XXI-XXIII, 1956.

Ginsberg, A. M. Escolha do Companheiro de Carteira, Resultado de um Inquerito entre Escolares Baianos, *Psyke*, 1, 3, 1947.

Ginsberg, A. M. Um Estudo Psicologico de Imigrantes e Migrantes, *Revista de Psicologia Normal e Patologica*, 1-2, 1964.

Gouveia, A. J. A Escola e o Professor na Opiniao dos Pais, *Educaçao e Ciencias Sociais*, 2, 5, 1957.

Hutchinson, C. J. A. Notas Preliminares ao Estudo da Familia no Brasil *Anais da I Reuniao Brasileira de Antropologia*, 1957.

Mugiatti, R. O. Dialogo Impossivel entre Filhos e Pais - Inquerito IBOPE - Manchete, *Manchete*, 743, 1966.

Maynard Araujo, A. A Familia numa Comunidade Alagoana, *Sociologia*, XVII, 1955.

Pfromm Netto, S. *Psicologia da Adolescencia*. Sao Paulo, Pioneira Edit., 1968.

Pierson, D. Familia e Compadrio numa Comunidade Rural Paulista. *Sociologia*, 16, 1954.

Willems, W. The Structure of the Brazilian Family, *Social Forces*, XXXI, 1953.

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

Considering the item relative to the adults living with the child sampled, in the same house, the results of the interviews showed a great difference between the subjects of the two social classes studied. While in the upper lower class eighty percent of the children lived with both their parents only, in the upper middle the same occurred for thirty-eight percent of the children. More than half (fifty-three percent) of the children of this class lived with one or more adults and nonrelatives besides their parents. This fact that at first sight seems peculiar may be easily explained; in Brazil it is usual in the upper social classes to have one or more maids living with the family. Therefore, if it is of interest to verify whose children live with both their parents, not taking into account the maids, then a percentage of ninety percent would be obtained for the upper middle class.

In the whole sample there was found only one case of a child living with only one of the parents, a fourteen-year-old boy from the upper lower class.

Only ten children (thirteen percent) from the whole sample lived with one or more relatives besides the parents--this number was evenly distributed by social class, age and sex.

Neither the age nor the social class or the sex of the child made any significant difference as to who took main responsibility for him --both parents or just the mother. If to the responsibility of both parents is added the responsibility of the mother only, this represented a total of eighty-four percent of the children.

Only thirty-nine percent of the mothers interviewed were born in Sao Paulo city. The same percentage of mothers were born in a different town of the state of Sao Paulo. The number of mothers in both cases were fairly evenly distributed on all of the three variables, except for social class, in the case of mothers who were born in Sao Paulo city. A significantly greater number of upper middle mothers than upper lower mothers were born in Sao Paulo city. Mothers who were born in an adjacent state totaled eleven percent, not differing significantly in the three variables. Mothers who were born in a different state of Brazil plus those born in a different country totaled eleven percent. Also, these data did not show any significant differences concerning the three variables studied.

A smaller percentage of fathers (thirty-three percent) than of mothers (thirty-nine percent) were born in Sao Paulo city.

As in the case of the mothers, the number was fairly evenly distributed, regarding age and sex, but for social class, significantly more fathers of the upper middle class (forty-eight percent) than of the upper lower (eighteen percent) were born in Sao Paulo city. A greater number of fathers (thirty-eight percent) of the total sample were born in a different town of the State of Sao Paulo than in the City of Sao Paulo (thirty-three percent), the number being fairly evenly distributed in all three variables. Fifteen percent of the fathers were born in an adjacent state; and fourteen percent were born either in a different state of Brazil or a different country, and no significant difference occurred in any of the three variables considered.

Concerning the age of the mothers, the results showed that seventy-three percent are between thirty-five and forty-four years of age. The numbers were fairly evenly distributed among the three variables.

As far as age of fathers is concerned, in the range twenty-five to thirty-nine (with a percentage of twenty percent of the total sample) the ten-year-old subjects had a significantly greater (thirty-three percent) number of younger fathers than did the fourteen-year-olds (eight percent), as might be expected.

The social class also showed a significant difference, with more fathers in the upper lower class (thirty percent) falling in this age range.

In the age range of forty to forty-four, with a percentage of twenty-nine percent of the total sample, the upper middle class showed significantly more fathers (forty-three percent) than did the upper lower one (fifteen percent), and no significant differences occurred regarding age or sex of the children.

About a third (thirty-three percent) of the fathers were in the age range of forty-five to forty-nine, but no significant differences occurred regarding the variables. Eighty percent of the mothers in the sample did not have a paid occupation, there being exactly the same number in the upper lower and upper middle classes. The remaining twenty percent of the mothers had occupations for which the levels vary from three to six. So no mothers in the sample had occupations in level one or two. Neither age nor social class or sex of the children showed any significant difference regarding the mothers' occupations.

The significant results on the question concerning father's occupation in relation to social class were exactly what had been expected, as a careful grading of occupations had been built into the sample selection.

Neither the age nor the sex of the children showed any significant difference regarding the father's level of occupation.

While twenty-nine percent of the fathers of the children sampled had some or complete university education, all of them from the upper middle class, the same was true for only three mothers (four percent of the total sample) of the same social class.

Regarding the educational qualification of the parents, the age variable and, as might be expected, social class produced some significant differences. Significantly more upper middle class mothers (fifty-five percent) had finished high school, than had upper lowers (five percent); on the other hand, significantly more upper lower class mothers (ninety percent of the total sample) than upper middle (ten percent) had completed just the elementary school or had less education than that.

As to the father's education, significantly more upper middle fathers (fifty-eight percent) had finished university or, at least had some university, than did upper lower fathers, since in this last social class not one father reached that level of education. On the other hand, significantly more fathers of the upper lower class (eighty-three percent) than of the upper middle (three percent) had just completed elementary school or had less education than that.

Concerning the age of the children, significantly more ten-year-olds (thirty-eight percent) had parents with a level five education than did fourteen-year-olds (thirteen percent).

The sample showed similar frequencies in the results concerning the time of permanence in the present house. In no one period of permanence (divided in periods of two years) appeared a frequency higher than nineteen percent. There was no significant difference in relation to the studied variables, except in relation to age, where there were significantly more parents of fourteen-year-old children (twenty-three) living in the same house for fifteen years or more, than for ten-year-olds (five percent).

Concerning geographical mobility, the data showed that fifty-nine percent of the sample lived only in one or no other place since the child sampled had been born. In these results no significant differences among the variables occurred.

Almost the whole sample of children (ninety-eight percent) had never been away from the home for six months or more.

Sixty-four percent of the children sampled had never been in a hospital, and thirty percent had only been there once. Among those who had never been hospitalized there was a significantly greater number of girls. Only a few children had been hospitalized for short periods with a significant predominance of males.

Significantly more mothers of girls (eighty percent) did not give information about time of hospitalization.

The majority (eighty-six percent) of parents interviewed had never lived regularly out of the home for six months or more.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

The parents' responses to these questions in the interview gave a picture of their children's academic standing and how they perceived and thought about the children's academic problems.

Thirty-nine percent of the mothers reported that their children had positive achievement in school. Only thirteen percent reported that their children had negative achievement in school. Other mothers (twenty-five percent) considered their children's achievement to be mixed.

Concerning the children's attitude toward school, thirty-six percent of the mothers indicated that their children had a strong positive attitude, forty-eight percent that they had a positive one, and nine percent that they had an ambivalent one. So the picture was very positive, as only one percent saw their children responding with a negative attitude toward school.

In relation to the reasons why their children like or dislike school, twenty-six percent of the mothers reported intrinsic values plus academic subjects; eighteen percent reported extracurricular activities plus school environment; nineteen percent reported social aspects of school and ten percent interaction with teacher.

In terms of achievement in relation to children's peers, eighteen percent of the mothers reported this as being excellent; twenty-eight percent, above average; sixteen percent barely above average; nineteen percent average. Only eight percent considered that they were below average and nine percent poor workers at school.

Of the mothers interviewed forty-eight percent reported that they tried to motivate achievement in their children by attitudinal means, while thirteen percent did this mainly through assisting or supervising homework; and five percent provided enrichment in the form of books, materials or visits. Twenty percent of parents did not take any action to motivate achievement.

Of all the mothers, sixty-six percent made no reference about the time homework was done by their children; ten percent said that their children gave high priority to their homework; and fourteen percent said that they did it at a regular time. Only eight percent did it irregularly or did not do it at all.

According to some mothers' reports (thirty-nine percent), their children did their homework frequently by self-initiation; only eight percent needed someone to always ask them to do their task; and ten percent did the task in the manner of self-other initiation.

Only five percent always put off their homework in order to do other things. The great majority (sixty-eight percent) seldom or never showed this behavior. If they made a mistake forty-six percent of the children would start again without emotion; thirteen percent would start again but would be unhappy in doing so, and five percent would be angry to have to start again. Only four percent would not have redone the work.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

The fourteen-year-old group differed significantly from the ten-year-old one with regard to the mothers' opinion concerning the child's school achievement. About one-half of the mothers of fourteen-year-olds considered in a positive way their child's school achievement while only twenty-three percent of the ten-year-olds' mothers had the same opinion about their children.

With respect to the motives that caused the subjects to like or dislike school, the differences between age groups were significant, also. While twenty-eight percent of the ten-year-old mothers mentioned the extracurricular activities and school environment as rationales for their children's opinion, in the fourteen-year-old group only eight percent of the mothers indicated the same motives.

More mothers of ten-year-olds (twenty-eight percent) considered their children's school achievement as barely above average. In the fourteen-year-old group, only five percent of the mothers scored their children's school achievement in that category.

There are more "don't know," irrelevant responses and absence of responses in the fourteen-year-old group than in the ten-year-old group (twenty-eight percent versus eight percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

When asked why their children like (or dislike) school, there were significant differences in the following responses: values intrinsic to school work, extracurricular activities and social aspects of school life. Whereas the upper lower group mentioned intrinsic values more frequently than did the upper middle group (forty-three percent and ten percent, respectively), the upper middle group mentioned more frequently extracurricular activities (thirty percent and five percent) and social aspects of school (thirty percent and eight percent, respectively).

There were no significant differences in relation to other categories. So, whereas the upper lower class concentrated on the academic aspects of school life, the upper middle emphasized their recreative aspects.

3. Sex

Regarding school achievement the responses given by the mothers did not differentiate one sex from the other. However, some trends did appear, as can be seen from inspection of the relevant tables.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The study of the responses of mothers concerning the academic performance of their children presented differences that can be a result of the different contacts they have had with their children when variables like age, social class and sex are considered. The responses were more favorable to the ten-year-olds, the upper middle and for girls.

As parents have more frequent contact, and a more affective control in relation to the ten-year-old children than they do in relation to the adolescents, their perception of academic task achievement of the ten-year-olds may be more realistic than what they report about the fourteen-year-old group. In this last case they presented a more positive evaluation because adolescents have more freedom than children and the parents have fewer contacts with secondary schools than with elementary schools. The differences of responses between mothers of upper lower and upper middle classes could be a result of different points of view of the two groups concerning the school's function and also be related to a different scale of values of the two classes.

As mothers of the upper lower class gave great importance to the school's intrinsic values, it is possible that they projected in their children the same values. This result can also be considered from other points of view. It is possible that as their home environment is less interesting and as they know that school is necessary to their individual progress, the upper lower class children actually plaud more intrinsic value in school than did those from the upper middle class.

The fact that mothers considered girls' performance more satisfactory than that of boys can be a result of a higher identification between mother and daughter than between mother and son.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

In the questions presented to mothers in order to obtain their aspirations and expectations for the children, the general picture was as follows.

The great majority (fifty-nine percent) of the mothers had as their aspiration for their children to be university graduates and twenty-one percent said they wanted their children to finish high school. Concerning their expectations, the responses showed that thirty-six percent of the mothers interviewed considered that their children in fact would enter university and twenty percent would finish the high school. Only six percent had an educational level lower than high school in mind, but twenty-three percent felt that their children would not complete high school.

A fair number of the mothers (thirty-eight percent) wanted for their children the highest occupational level, but it was interesting that fourteen percent would like their children to take up what they wanted or would make them happy.

On the negative side of the occupational area, twenty-one percent of the mothers reported that they did not have any restriction as to the future occupation of their children: any one would be all right. Eleven percent made some restrictions on some particular occupations and twenty-nine percent made restrictions on low status occupations.

When the parents were asked about what type of work they thought their children would like to take up, forty-eight percent reported some occupation of the highest or near the highest level.

On the other hand, when asked about the occupation the children really would have when grown up, in their opinion, forty percent of the mothers reported that they did not know and only thirty-one percent mentioned a high status job.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

The fourteen-year-old mothers chose for their children the highest prestige occupations (level one) more frequently than did the mothers of ten-year-olds (fifty percent and twenty-five percent, respectively). As far as other levels were concerned, there were no significant age differences in this behavioral area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

So far as educational aspirations for their children were concerned seventy-eight percent of upper middle class mothers and forty percent of upper lower class mothers would like their children to become college graduates. The percentages of these groups expecting this outcome were sixty percent and thirteen percent respectively. On the other hand, whereas only ten percent of the upper middle social class mothers wanted their children to study until junior high school, thirty-three percent of the upper lower class mothers wanted this educational level for their children. So educational aspiration was higher among upper middle social class mothers.

There were significant differences in both socioeconomic levels in relation to the mother's occupational aspiration for their children. Upper middle class mothers mentioned significantly more often occupations of college level (fifty percent) than upper lower mothers did (twenty-five percent). These data were consonant with that mentioned above, relative to educational expectations.

Significant differences appeared in relation to occupations highest in the occupational scale. Fifty-eight percent of upper middle mothers believed their children would like to have jobs pertaining to level one of occupational scale, whereas only twenty-five percent of upper lower mothers thought so.

Concerning the work mothers felt the children would probably do when grown up, upper middle social class mothers mentioned more frequently (thirty-eight percent) than upper lower mothers (thirteen percent) high status occupations. On the other hand, responses indicating that mothers did not have any idea about the vocational future of their children were more frequent among upper lower social class mothers than among upper middle ones (fifty-three percent and twenty-eight percent). Really, the future is more uncertain to people of lower socioeconomic status.

3. Sex

Concerning the school expectation for their children, the others had higher aspirations in relation to the boys than to the girls, because they significantly more frequently wanted boys (seventy-five percent) than girls (forty-three percent) to go to the university. The same pattern continued in relation to high school: thirty-three percent of mothers would like their girls to finish secondary school and ten percent of the boys' mothers wanted that.

Concerning their expectations, the mothers appeared to be more realistic in relation to the educational area, but the same pattern continued; significantly more mothers of boys (fifty-three percent) than of girls (twenty percent) said that they thought their child actually would enter university.

In the responses to occupational questions there were significantly more mothers of boys (sixty percent) that said they would like their children to have a job of level one than mothers of girls (fifteen percent). A similar result appeared in relation to their child's aspiration when sixty percent of the mothers of boys thought their children would like a professional job while only twenty-three percent of the mothers of girls expressed the same view.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Overall the parents appeared to not be very realistic in their aspirations but more realistic in relation to their expectations.

Relatively few items presented significant differences when the variables sex, age and social class were considered. Whether aspiration or expectation was considered in the educational area, the patterns of responses were very similar: they were more favorable to the fourteen-year-olds, upper middle class and boys than to ten-year-olds, upper lower class and girls.

An expectation of college or university as high as shown in the responses is not very realistic, because entrance at that school level in Brazil is not easy. This is especially true in the case of the upper lower class. The parents of the upper middle class seemed to have a more realistic approach because they have more possibilities to enter their children in the university.

The fact that the picture we obtained from the data was more favorable to boys can be the result of a social premise, i.e., that formal education is more important for boys than it is for girls. As educational level is associated with occupational level, it appears to be more important for boys to stand higher because they should have the responsibility for the management of the family.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

The questions in the interview that asked to obtain a picture of the child's nonacademic activities presented the following overall results:

All the mothers were able to list at least one activity in which their children engaged when they were out of school. The most frequent response was the listing of five or more activities (twenty-six percent) and in second place was the listing of four activities (twenty-one percent). Other mothers reported two (sixteen percent) or at least one activity (thirteen percent) of this kind for their children.

In the case of more specific questions concerning joint activities of children and parents, forty-three percent of the mothers reported constructive activities; twenty-eight percent, nonverbal activities with positive affective interaction; ten percent, verbal activities; and nine percent reported that the only type of interaction they had was of a neutral nature. Only five percent indicated negative affect as the main interaction.

Activities with the father were reported by forty percent of the mothers to be of the nonverbal positive affect type; by twenty-one percent of the mothers of a kind of negative of lack of interaction and, by fifteen percent of activities of a constructive nature.

Concerning the question about the child's activities with the whole family, the most frequent response (forty percent) pertained to various kinds of outings, followed by indoor activities (eighteen percent). All mothers were able to list at least one activity that their children did with all of the family.

A quite large number of children (thirty-nine percent) did not belong to any club or organized group. Forty-five percent were members of sport clubs, four percent of organized groups and six percent of other kinds of groups or clubs.

To the question about the interest of the children in relation to nonacademic activities, the responses indicated that twenty-six percent of the children had some activities of a cultural nature, thirteen percent did something of an academic nature, nine percent had intellectual recreation and eight percent had a sport as recreation. In this case it occurred that quite a large number of children were not interested in nonacademic activities of a non-organized nature (thirty-five percent).

Concerning the question about jobs or chores that the children had to accomplish in and around the house, the most frequent response was cleaning house (eighteen percent) followed by dishwashing (sixteen percent) and washing windows, laundry, shoe cleaning, cooking, caring for children (eleven percent).

Concerning the reasons that the subjects gave to justify the child's jobs around the house, the most frequent was the one concerning the need to help parents (forty-six percent) followed by the fact that the child wanted to do it (nineteen percent).

The mothers reported also in a great majority of cases that never (fifty-four percent) or seldom (fourteen percent) did their children have to be reminded to do their chores and only four percent reported that they had to remind the children in this situation.

The majority of mothers (sixty-six percent) reported that the children did their chores without asking for assistance from anyone else, but other mothers said that asking help from siblings (eleven percent) or from parents (eight percent), were frequent reactions of their children. Concerning the quality of these jobs, the responses showed that the subjects considered that they were good (forty percent), excellent (thirty percent), or satisfactory (nineteen percent). No response indicated that any of the mothers considered that the children performed poorly.

From the mothers' sample, twenty-four percent reported the fact that their children never did anything around the house without being requested, but others said that this occurred in variable frequencies, such as always (twenty-one percent), frequently (fifteen percent), sometimes (thirteen percent) or seldom (twenty-one percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Regarding activities accomplished when the subjects were not in school, the mothers of fourteen-year-olds indicated three activities with a significantly different percentage (thirty-five percent) than did mothers of ten-year-olds (thirteen percent).

Among activities that subjects did with father, going out and going to church showed a frequency significantly higher in the ten-year-old group (forty percent versus fifteen percent).

Regarding follow-up to see that the child did what was asked by the parents, more mothers of fourteen-year-olds (sixty-eight percent) reported that it was not necessary to see if their children were doing what was asked, while only forty percent of the mothers of ten-year-olds reported the same about their children.

2. Socioeconomic Status

As far as socioeconomic level was concerned, twenty-three percent of the upper lower social class mothers indicated that their children did only one kind of activity when they were not at school, while only three percent of the upper middle class mothers reported only one activity.

There was significant difference in relation to nonverbal activities and positive affect when mother and child were together. Forty percent of the upper middle social class mothers indicated this kind of interaction and only fifteen percent of the upper lower social class mothers mentioned it.

Surprisingly, sixty-eight percent of the upper middle class mothers mentioned that their children were enlisted in sport clubs, whereas only twenty-three percent of the upper lower social class mothers reported this. On the other hand, when one considers responses such as "doesn't belong to any sport club," frequencies were inverted: sixty-three percent of the upper lower social class mothers said that their children did not belong to any club, whereas only fifteen percent of the upper middle class gave this kind of information.

With respect to question 43-1, the upper middle social class mothers mentioned more frequently that their children had cultural (forty percent) and academic (twenty-eight percent) activities out of school, whereas only thirteen percent of upper lower social class mothers reported that their children had cultural activities and three percent that they had tutorial classes out of school. Therefore, "none" category presented different results: sixty-three percent of the upper-lower mothers' responses were of this kind whereas only eight percent of the upper middle social class mothers' responses were so.

Of the chores listed, there was a significant difference only for dishwashing. Twenty-eight percent of upper lower mothers mentioned their children doing dishes but only three percent of upper middle class mothers did so.

According to the mothers' interviews, the upper lower class children did homework without supervision more frequently than did the upper middle social class children (sixty-eight percent versus forty percent).

Upper lower mothers more often reported that their children did not ask others to do their chores than did upper middle mothers (seventy-eight percent and fifty-three percent respectively).

3. Sex

In the case of nonacademic activities, significantly more girls' mothers (fifty-eight percent) reported constructive activities than did the boys' mothers (twenty-eight percent).

Only thirty percent of the boys' mothers reported that their children did some task in order to clean or order the house, but sixty-three percent of the girls' mothers gave this information concerning their child.

It was surprising that a significantly greater number of boys' mothers (twenty-five percent) than of girls' mothers (five percent) reported that they went together to church on Sundays.

There were no significant differences between boys and girls in relation to activities pursued in clubs. However, there were significantly more girls (fifty-three percent) than boys (twenty-five percent) who were not members of clubs or other organized groups of children or adolescents. The same pattern occurred in relation to the hobbies question: more girls (thirty-three percent) than boys (eight percent) did not have some hobby.

The girls' mothers reported that thirty-three percent of the girls did some constructive activities at home such as cleaning or washing up by themselves without being asked to. Only ten percent of the boys' mothers reported the same thing.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The picture presented by the responses about nonacademic activities showed that there was a lot of participation on the part of the children in family activities and there were also interactions with parents and friends, but there were differences in relation to age, social class and sex.

Actually, as the children grew up they had more activities outside and less contact with the parents. However, it appeared that they progressively were considered more responsible in doing their jobs or chores in and around the house.

This result was not a disturbing one because in all cultures as the children's growing occurs, it is assumed that they have to take progressively more responsibilities and engage in more activities, especially with peers.

The differences reported in relation to social classes showed that the upper lower class did more chores such as cleaning or washing and they had less outside interests or hobbies, and the same was true in relation to clubs or other recreative groups. This result presented the upper lower child as a person who had a lot of work but very few rewards. On the other hand, the upper middle class child, in this picture, appeared as a person who had less work at home and more recreative and cultural activities out of school and at home.

In this context, the culturally disadvantaged children must have more school assistance in order to have more interesting extracurricular activities at school than do the upper middle class children. However, actually, Brazilian schools for socially deprived children are not equipped to do this kind of task very well.

The differences between the children from the two classes resulted mainly from the differences in economic resources and in the parents' educational level.

Concerning out of home activities, the upper lower class children did less than did the upper middle class in the opinion of their parents. It is possible to consider a bias in that the result may be due to the problem of communication between parents and interviewers.

The upper lower class children did more work in the house, helping parents, because they must do their part in order to permit more savings at home. Since, at an early age, they began to work and, as their mothers were very busy and did not have time to watch their work, they had to be more responsible. Then it is easy to understand why their mothers reported that they worked well without assistance, help or even request. As the upper middle class children did not have the habit of helping their parents at home, when they must do something they had to have more assistance and did the work less spontaneously than did the upper lower class children.

The results with respect to sex probably were determined by social premises. Generally, it is considered that males must assert their independence more than females. The girls must conform to the female patterns in the family, that is, they have to spend more time around the house and help parents spontaneously more frequently than do the boys. All the female education favors an earlier responsibility level compared to the males.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

One other dimension considered in the interview was Authority.

To the questions concerning this subject, parents had to answer as to how the children reacted to their authority and what they did when punished or when criticized by somebody.

Twenty-four percent of the mothers reported that their children reacted with negative acceptance of their authority, and twenty-one percent that the reaction of their children was of positive acceptance. Other mothers (sixteen percent) reported only emotional reactions. On the other side, only eight percent indicated that their children would react neutrally, obeying without any manifestation of feelings. No reaction was reported by nine percent, while for eleven percent the response would vary according to the situation.

The mothers indicated various reactions that the children gave to a disciplinary situation. The same number of mothers reported "grumbles," "complains," "pouts," "sulks," withdraw avoidance (twenty percent) and getting angry (twenty percent); fifteen percent reported that the children reacted with positive acceptance, while sixteen percent did not react at all. Only eight percent of the mothers indicated that they never disciplined or punished their children. But when criticism of the child by the mother was the focus of the question, four percent of mothers only reported, "I don't criticize." Twenty-six percent of the mothers reported the child's response to her criticism being of a defensive verbal nature. Other mothers indicated that the child became hurt or cried (twenty-one percent) and that the reactions depended on the situation (fourteen percent). Only four percent indicated that they did not criticize.

The children's reaction to the father's punishment was reported by the mothers as of acceptance or apologizing nature (twenty-four percent); depending on the situation (twenty-three percent); no overt reaction (sixteen percent); crying (sixteen percent); or hostile behavior (fourteen percent).

The mothers reported also that the children presented different reactions when criticized by the father. They reported that the children stayed quiet, in twenty-three percent of the responses, got hurt or cried (eighteen percent), reacted with defensive verbal response (fifteen percent) or laughed at the father or ignored him (eleven percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Frequency of crying as a reaction to punishment was significantly different in ten- and fourteen-year-old groups, whether punishment was applied by father (twenty-eight percent versus five percent) or by mother (thirty percent versus ten percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

Concerning the question regarding the way children reacted when punished by the father, the following was found:

Significant differences were associated with responses such as "take well," "make amends" and "rational discussion." Together these responses appeared in thirty-five percent of the mother's interviews of upper middle class, whereas in only thirteen percent of the mother's interviews of the upper lower class.

There were significant differences in hostile verbal reactions; this kind of response was more frequent in the upper lower class (thirty-eight percent) than in the upper middle class (eight percent).

As far as the second kind of children's reaction to father's punishment was concerned, the upper lower social class mothers referred more frequently to verbal hostile reactions (eighty-three percent) than did mothers of the upper middle class (forty-eight percent).

Upper lower mothers referred more frequently to crying and depressive reactions (thirty-three percent) than did upper middle mothers (ten percent), when talking about the children's reactions to the mother's criticism.

3. Sex

There was one significant sex difference in the responses to Authority questions. When mothers reported how their children reacted when asked to do something, more mothers of boys (twenty-eight percent) considered that their children reacted emotionally and with complaints than did girls' mothers (eight percent).

c. Summary and Interpretation

On the whole, the picture presented by the parents' responses to the series of questions concerning authority was in accord with the cultural premises and with what one could expect would occur as the child grew up. In this line of consideration it was to be expected that the children usually cried progressively less when punished by father or mother, and that they had to develop other patterns of behavior more in accord with socially adequate behavior in the situation.

In the upper lower class the results showed more negative and unsuitable behavior patterns in relation to authority than did the results for the upper middle class children. There was the possibility that the parents' responses were more in accord with the social expectancies and with reality in the case of the upper middle class mothers.

If this is true, the differences between the two social classes would be less apparent than the results showed.

In order to explain the differences in social class it was possible also to say that as the lower class mothers spent more time with their children in working interaction, they had to discipline their children more frequently than did the upper middle class mothers; and in this case they had more experience and examples of the child's reactions than did the upper middle class mothers. The upper middle class mothers disciplined their children less, so there were less opportunities to know how children reacted to authority or if their reaction was negative or not.

The results showed that there were no differences between boys and girls when they had to face authority.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

There were no significant results.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

In the behavioral area of Interpersonal Relations, criticism coming from siblings or friends produced strong reactions in children in the opinion of forty-nine percent of the mothers, while twenty-six percent of the mothers reported mild reactions of their children in this kind of situation. Four percent only reported that the child reacted by positive acceptance, and only three percent said that the children had no reaction when criticized by siblings or friends. It was interesting to note that thirteen percent of the mothers indicated that their child was not criticized by those persons.

When considering the way their children got along with other children, a great many of the mothers (forty-three percent) reported that their children got along in an average way with other children; others (thirty-six percent) said that their children got on excellently or very well with others. Ten percent only indicated that their children got along poorly in this kind of situation.

When asked about their children's behavior in this situation the more frequent response given by the mothers was that the children had a temper. Nine percent of the mothers reported that their children were leaders in their group, but twenty-one percent said that their children had few friends. Other mothers (twenty percent) considered that their children had some very close or long-time friend.

In relation to the friends' influence upon children's behavior, forty-eight percent of the mothers indicated that they did not consider that their children's friends had any influence on them. Other mothers considered them having neutral influence (sixteen percent), or a specific influence (thirteen percent), a general influence of a bad nature (eight percent) or even a general influence of a good nature (eleven percent).

In response to the question "What does the child usually do when he gets angry?" the mothers' responses in some cases showed that, in their opinion, the children showed depressive negative affect (forty-five percent) and others reported withdrawal (nineteen percent) from the situation. Fourteen percent of the children expressed their reaction in a hostile aggressive way, and eight percent indicated that the children were able to cope with the situation, using a positive attitude toward friends or siblings.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

When someone hurt the subject's feelings, the ten-year-old showed more negative depressive affect (fifty-eight percent) than did the older group (thirty-three percent). This was the only significant difference.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Fifty percent of the middle class mothers did nothing to help their children get along with other children, but only fifteen percent of upper lower social class mothers answered this question this way. On the other hand, negative approach training was mentioned by thirty percent of mothers from the upper lower social class and by only three percent of mothers from the upper middle social class. If these results are true, they indicate that middle class mothers intervene less in their children's interpersonal relations than upper lower social class mothers. These teach, in a significant percentage of cases, their children to avoid situations such as don't fight, don't boss, don't be a friend of bad boys and girls and so on.

As far as the ways children's friends influence their behavior, there was a significant difference in one of the categories, that of specific influences. Whereas twenty-three percent of mothers from the upper middle social class level made references to specific influences of their children's friends upon their behavior, only one (three percent) of the upper lower social class mothers interviewed mentioned this kind of influence. The results concerning the mothers' opinions about this influence were the following: thirty-three percent of middle class mothers gave ambivalent, conditional and situational responses, whereas eight percent of upper lower social class mothers indicated that they had this reaction.

3. Sex

There was one significant sex difference only.

Significantly more mothers of boys (sixty percent) reported that their children's friends had no influence on the children's behavior as compared with thirty-five percent of girls' mothers.

c. Summary and Interpretation

As might be expected, as the children grew up, they presented less negative depressive affect when having trouble with other persons.

The mothers of the upper middle class observed more peer influence on their children's behavior.

As this social class considered imitative behavior as an undesirable form of behavior, and as they valued more leadership, the mothers of this class were more upset about the influence of their children's associates on their child's personal behavior.

As boys have more freedom and are less controlled by parents, they may actually be more influenced by their peers, thus the result concerning sex differences could be expected.

Overall, the behavior picture of the subjects in interpersonal relations showed that they were very sensitive to criticism and esteem from their peers.

VII. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

In the answers to some items of the parents' interview, the behavioral area concerning their children's anxiety was considered.

When asked about what the children do when they become worried, forty-one percent of the mothers reported that the children stayed depressed or presented anxious affect; twenty-one percent considered that the children presented lack of action or affect; eighteen percent indicated that the child talked about his worries with someone else; eight percent reported withdrawal or very specific behavioral responses; six percent of the subjects reported that the children tried to remain calm and five percent also said that the children did not worry in this situation.

When the mothers considered the causes of anxiety behavior in their children, they reported the following picture: forty-four percent said the main cause for the children's concern was academic problems; fifteen percent reported worries of war, death or health problems; thirteen percent reported worries concerning self-image; ten percent reported family problems as the cause for children's concern and only six percent reported as causes for children's worry personal appearance and peer relationships.

Concerning to whom children turned when worried, forty-four percent of mothers reported that the children turned to mothers, another ten percent reported that the children turned to father or both parents to ask for help. Eight percent only reported that the children turned to siblings or someone outside the family. Thirty-three percent of the mothers reported that when their children were worried they did not turn to others for help.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Regarding turning to others for help when worried, the responses showed that the ten-year-old subjects turn to the mothers more frequently (sixty percent) than did the fourteen-year-old subjects (twenty-eight percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

Upper middle class mothers referred more frequently than did upper lower class mothers to the fact that their children usually got worried in relation to death, war, health and institutions (government, church). Twenty-five percent of the upper middle class mothers pointed out these kinds of worries, whereas only five percent of upper lower class mothers did this. There were no other significant differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The differences that occurred in this behavioral area showed that the adolescents needed less help than did the children, and that the upper lower class mothers considered that their children had more anxiety in relation to social and health problems than did upper middle class mothers.

The differences in relation to the age variable may be the result of the adolescents growing up and of their need of independence and freedom from the parents' control. The social class differences can be a result of the two classes' styles of life. In the upper lower class the child has duties in relation to the family at a much earlier age.

VIII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

A great number of children (forty-six percent) got angry at everyday annoyances inflicted upon them by others. This kind of response was followed by the parents' or authorities' control over children's behavior (twenty-eight percent). Only eleven percent mentioned that the children got angry at major grievances.

The question presented to the mothers concerning what the children usually did when getting angry showed that twenty-six percent expressed verbal hostility; twenty percent of the mothers said that the children presented hostile or aggressive affect; thirteen percent expressed depressed or anxious affect and the same number of mothers said that the children used physical aggression when angry. Ten percent of mothers reported withdrawal by the child. Only six percent reported no observable action or affect.

When asked about the child being angry with the mother herself, thirteen percent reported negative or depressed emotional reaction.

Other mothers (nineteen percent) reported withdrawal of or need of affection of the child in this situation; fifteen percent reported verbal aggression and thirteen percent reported a behavioral rebellion.

Mothers reported that the children presented the following behaviors when getting angry at the father: negative or hostile emotional reaction (ten percent); no action or affect (ten percent); withdrawal (nine percent); verbal aggression (ten percent); and control of affect in eight percent of the cases. The most frequent responses (twenty-one percent) were individual ones not classifiable in any of the other categories.

Concerning situations involving angry behavior from children's friends, many mothers (nineteen percent) reported that the children presented no reaction; others (sixteen percent) mentioned hostile behavior or action, while eight percent reported that the children reinstated the friendship or simply accepted the friend's reaction. Some children denied the situation (fifteen percent); others (eight percent) presented withdrawal responses or simply went to substitute friends.

In this context, the picture presented by mothers about their children's behavior in situations of coping with aggression did not show the children to be well adjusted.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

As far as getting angry with their mothers was concerned, thirty-three percent of mothers of the fourteen-year-old group reported withdrawing reactions and need of affection more frequently than did mothers of ten-year-old children (eight percent). Regarding what children did when they got angry with a friend, there was a significant difference relative to responses of no reaction: thirty-three percent in the fourteen-year-old group as compared to five percent in the ten-year-old group.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Mothers of upper lower and upper middle social classes differed in their relation to the two kinds of reactions that they attributed to their children when they were angry: hostile affect and verbal hostility.

Whereas thirty percent of the upper lower mothers pointed out hostile affect as the main kind of reaction of their children when they got angry, only ten percent of upper middle mothers did it. On the other hand, forty-three percent of mothers of the upper middle social class pointed out verbal hostility as the usual reactions of their children when angry, whereas only thirteen percent of the upper lower social class mothers referred to this kind of reaction.

When they got angry at their mothers, subjects of both social classes differed significantly in relation to reactions of verbal aggression. Twenty-eight percent of mothers of the upper middle class referred to this kind of reaction compared to only three percent of the upper lower social class mothers.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

When getting angry at their mothers, children and adolescents presented different reactions. The responses of parents of lower and middle class showed differences in the way their children coped with aggression.

There were also differences in their reactions to fathers and mothers.

The age differences could be explained as a function of the fact that children growing up can learn new ways to cope with aggression and can get angry with parents more easily.

The class differences can be a result of the methods of child training used by the two classes considered in this research. It also could be explained in terms of class differences in valuing the use of aggressive responses in coping with a situation and in relation to father's and mother's authority.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

Parents, on the whole (seventy-five percent), did not express an opinion about their degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the child's progress. Only five percent expressed dissatisfaction while twenty percent expressed satisfaction.

A reasonable proportion of parents (thirty-four percent) had never met their child's teacher. Others met the teacher through school-initiated contacts (ten percent) as the result of specific invitations and twenty-eight percent on formal routine occasions. Parent-initiated contact, either formal or informal, was reported by twenty-eight percent.

Most parents (forty-eight percent) reported trying to encourage their children at school by stressing attitudinal aspects of education. Ten percent reported taking direct action, either punishment or reward, while twenty percent reported doing nothing to encourage their children.

When asked what they did in order to see that the child got his homework done the parents in forty-one percent of the cases reported that they checked or observed the child's homework. On the other hand, thirty-nine percent indicated that they did not do that because they considered that their assistance was not necessary and ten percent did nothing but did not give a reason.

About the school's job or responsibility, the parents' responses showed that they considered that school must educate the child (forty percent). Concerning instilling values, teaching discipline or building character the responses were fifteen percent; teaching school subjects or culture, thirteen percent, and preparing children for life and job, eleven percent.

A great part of parents indicated that they felt that school was most (thirty-eight percent) or very (fifty-three percent) important. In response to why they considered the school so important the most frequent answer was: "because the school gives a global preparation for life" (fifty percent) and in the second place that the school was important for the personal development of the child (sixteen percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Concerning mother's satisfaction or dissatisfaction regarding their children's school achievement, there were significant differences between age groups. Ninety percent of the ten-year-olds' mothers and sixty percent of the fourteen-year-olds' mothers showed no direct indication of satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with their children's school achievement. There was more indication of satisfaction and positive affect concerning school achievement by the fourteen-year-olds' mothers (thirty-three percent) than by the ten-year-olds' mothers (eight percent).

More fourteen-year-olds' mothers (fifty-five percent) reported never having met their children's teachers. In the ten-year-old group, only thirteen percent of the mothers reported the same.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The fourteen-year-olds' mothers appeared to be more satisfied with their children's progress at school than were mothers of the ten-year-olds. On the other hand more mothers of adolescents had never met the teachers of their children than had the mothers of the ten-year-olds.

An analysis of these data suggests that the fourteen-year-olds' mothers reported more satisfaction in relation to their children's progress, perhaps, because they were less informed of their children's achievement at school than were the mothers of the ten-year-old children.

There was little evidence that the adolescents' mothers had a close relationship with the teacher and the school of their children. So it is possible that they had a distorted view of their children's achievement at school. As the mothers of the younger group had a more close parent-teacher relationship, they may have been more realistic and less satisfied with their children's school achievement.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

Considering the item of parents wanting their children to do something, about half of the parents (fifty-one percent) said that they made the request in a mild polite way at the beginning; others (twenty-one percent) made a simple presentation or rational explanation and twenty-percent had to order or demand in a directive way. They frequently reported also that they did not do anything in order to follow-up the child in doing a request from them (fifty-eight percent). Other parents reported that the children always obey (twenty-four percent).

If they found that their children were doing a job incorrectly, twenty-eight percent of parents said that they would demonstrate or explain to the child the correct way; eight percent yelled or scolded. The majority did not find it necessary to do anything.

Deprivation of privileges was the most frequent method of punishment reported by thirty percent of mothers, while physical punishment was used by eighteen percent. Mild verbal (thirteen percent) and strong verbal (fifteen percent) were the next most frequently used methods. Praise or rational discussion was adopted by fifteen percent of mothers.

Fathers used verbal methods most often, mild (eighteen percent) and strongly (nineteen percent) with physical methods being almost as frequent (fifteen percent). Only eleven percent of mothers reported that fathers used rational discussion or praise.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Concerning the way the mothers discipline or punish their children, there were significant differences. Twenty-five percent of the ten-year-olds' mothers reported that they used strong verbal reprehension and threat, while in the fourteen-year-old group only five percent of the mothers reported the same.

More fourteen-year-olds' mothers (thirty percent) reported the use of mild verbal reprehension in order to discipline or punish their children than did ten-year-olds' mothers (five percent). So far as fathers were concerned, those of fourteen-year-olds more frequently used mild verbal methods (fifteen percent) than fathers of ten-year-olds (three percent); while more fathers of ten-year-olds used physical punishment (eleven percent) than did fathers of fourteen-year-olds (four percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

As far as techniques of controlling the child's behavior are concerned, it was observed that upper middle social class mothers reported more frequently (twenty-five percent) than did upper lower social class ones (five percent) rational discussion and positive reinforcement. This kind of data is in consonance with data colleged in several researches on child-rearing codes of communications between mother-child in different socioeconomic levels.

Thirty percent of upper lower social class mothers reported that their husbands did not punish their children; only eight percent of the upper middle social class gave this kind of information. One could explain this kind of data remembering that in the upper lower social class, the father was absent from home during all the day; generally they work too hard and far from their homes.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

There were differences in the way the mothers and fathers disciplined children and adolescents and in child-rearing practices in the two social classes considered in this research. The results are in accord with those shown in other research in this field.

III. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

In this behavioral area some parents (thirty-three percent) reported that they did not do anything to help their children to get along with their peers, and others (six percent) informed that they encouraged social activities of their children with peers. Positive training only on how to behave is reported by nineteen percent, discouragement of other behavior by sixteen percent, while twenty percent reported using both positive and negative training in order to educate the children for having a good interpersonal relation with peers.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Fifty percent of the upper middle social class mothers reported that they did not do anything in order to help their children get along well with other children; only fifteen percent of the upper lower social class mothers answered this question so. On the other hand, "training, negative approach" was reported by thirty percent of the upper lower social class mothers and only three percent of the upper middle class mothers.

3. Sex

There were no significant differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

There were no significant age or sex differences, but in relation to social class, differences were present.

These results seemed to indicate that the upper middle social class mothers interfered less in their children's social relations; upper lower class mothers interfered in a more active way and in a significant number of cases, they taught their children to avoid bad friends.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

When children were worried, forty percent of mothers offered personal reassurance or advised religious solace or physical activity. Taking direct action by working out the worry with the other person was advised by fifteen percent. The advice given would depend upon the situation for twenty percent.

b. Significant Differences

There were no significant age, class or sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The mothers reacted in various ways to their children's anxiety and the kind of help the children could take appeared to be more a problem of the mother's personality than a function of age or sex of the children or even of social class.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

More than one-third of the mothers in the sample (thirty-nine percent) took no other courses after leaving school. About twenty-nine percent of them attended just a domestic course, while only four percent were taking or had taken a course in the past four years.

Those who attended a professional, recreational or intellectual kind of course totaled another thirty percent. Mothers who attended courses, when asked about the reasons for doing so, answered mainly that it was for personal satisfaction (twenty-four percent of the whole sample) or for personal plus social and other reasons (nineteen percent). Only a few mothers answered that they did so for economic reasons (nine percent) or for self-improvement (six percent).

More than half of the mothers who had attended some course after leaving school said that it was shortly after school.

Almost half of the mothers who had been enrolled in some course declared that they did not finish it, but almost all of them, with only two exceptions, said it was profitable to attend the courses.

II. Occupational Aspects

Out of the eighty mothers interviewed, only sixteen or twenty percent had some paid occupation. From these, thirteen percent gave a descriptive answer when asked "What is your job like?" All but one of these mothers attributed positive affect to their jobs; about a third of the working mothers said that what they liked in their jobs was to have pleasant associates. A third said also that what they disliked in their jobs were the special characteristics of it. One-half of the mothers who worked declared that they would choose the same kind of work if they had to start again, and the other half declared that they would not. When problems came up at work, a little more than half said that they tried to solve the problem by themselves.

When it was asked what was the best way to get along with their fellow workers, almost a third of these mothers declared that it was to have good social relationships; a fourth, answered in terms of tolerance and almost another fourth declared that they worked alone.

Regarding the best way to get along with their boss or supervisors, half of the working mothers admitted that it was by doing the work well; an eighth answered in terms of respect, and this question was not applicable for the remaining mothers, probably because they had no boss or supervisor. It is worthwhile to note that in all these occupational aspects regarding mothers who have some paid occupation, neither the age nor the social class or sex of the children had any significant relationship.

III. Personal Characteristics

As to the question "What do you think or do when criticized?" twenty-five mothers (or thirty-one percent of the entire sample) said that they made a rational analysis or talked it over; twenty-three percent of the mothers just ignored; twenty-five percent disliked or took poorly, and eleven percent said that they made excuses or got angry. In this item there was only one significant difference: regarding social class, there were more upper middle subjects (twenty-one percent) than upper lower (ten percent) who made a rational analysis or used a rational verbal approach.

When the criticism was made by the husband the figures were twenty-four percent, six percent, twenty-one percent and fourteen percent, respectively for rational analysis and rational verbal, just ignore, dislike or take poorly, and defensive verbal, and fourteen percent took it well or laughted it off.

When the criticism was made by friends, the figures were, in the same order of categories as described above: twenty-eight percent, sixteen percent, ten percent, ten percent and eight percent.

In this case, significantly more upper middle mothers (forty percent) than upper lower (sixteen percent) gave the rational analysis response.

To the item concerning criticism coming from the children, twenty-four percent of the mothers said that this does not happen, fifteen percent took it well, fourteen percent disliked it, eleven percent used rational analysis, six percent punished the children, six percent used defensive verbal behavior, five percent ignored it, and five percent got angry. The only significant difference occurred in the category "takes well" where there were twenty-eight percent of the upper middle mothers and only three percent of the upper lower mothers.

When it was asked "What kind of things make you angry?" twenty-nine percent of the mothers said that the source of anger was the child; twenty-six percent specified petty annoyance; nineteen percent answered by annoying behavior of others plus spouce and plus work-related problems. Other cases were given, but in smaller proportions. There was a significant difference regarding the first category above, in relation to the social class variable: more upper lower mothers (forty percent) than upper middle (eighteen percent) declared that what made them angry was the child.

When asked about their reactions when angry, thirty percent of the mothers reported using physical and verbal aggression, fifteen showed no reaction, and fifteen percent got very upset. Only eighteen percent reported that they controlled their anger or coped positively.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Six out of the thirty-six possible correlations were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Engagement and Persistence in the Academic area also were correlated with this variable and with Coping Effectiveness in the Nonacademic area. Attitude toward Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Nonacademic Implementation. Neither Initiation nor Engagement, as measured by the question "When your child has homework, what does he usually do?" were correlated significantly with any of the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) dimensions.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

Three out of the thirty possible correlations were significant, one negative and two positive. Initiation in the Task Achievement area was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when asked to do something by the mother. In other words, the more the child initiated behavior in a homework situation the less likely he was to do a nonacademic task when asked to by the mother. However, Coping Effectiveness in the Academic area was correlated with successful coping when the child was criticized by his father. Engagement in Academic Task Achievement was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when the child was disciplined by his mother.

Neither Attitude nor Persistence in the Task Achievement (Academic) area was correlated with any of the Authority dimensions.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

Coping Effectiveness in the Interpersonal Relations area was assessed in three ways: Parent's Assessment of how their children got along with others, how children coped when other children hurt their feelings and how they coped when criticized by other children. Only the first of these was correlated with any of the Task Achievement (Academic) dimensions, negatively with Initiation and positiavely with Attitude and Persistence. There were no significant correlations for Engagement or Coping Effectiveness.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

There were no significant correlations here.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

There were four measures of Aggression. Coping with Aggression in general, coping when angry with the mother, angry with the father and angry with friends. Only one measure was correlated with any of the Task Achievement dimensions. Initiation was correlated negatively with Effectiveness in Coping when angry with friends. There were no other significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Three correlations out of a possible thirty were significant. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), as defined by the number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother, while Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated both with Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

There were significant correlations between Initiation and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of organized groups belonged to, and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) both were correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

Only one correlation was significant out of a possible twelve. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Only three out of a possible twenty-four correlations were significant but they all involved the variable of Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). This was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, with the father and with friends.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

Two out of a possible fifteen correlations were significant. The child's ability to cope effectively when asked to do something by his mother was correlated with ability to get along with other children. The child's ability to cope effectively when disciplined by the mother was correlated with ability to cope with criticism by other children.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

Only one correlation out of a possible ten was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Five out of a possible twenty correlations were significant, two negative and three positive. Coping Effectively with Aggression in general was correlated negatively with Coping in the Authority area when it was the father who punished or who criticized. On the other hand, coping effectively when angry with the mother, with the father and with friends was correlated positively with Coping in the Authority area when it was the mother who punished the child.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

Three out of a possible twelve correlations were significant. The ability of the child to cope when his feelings were hurt by other children was correlated with ability to cope with aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father, while Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

In the area of Child Behavior the maximum number of possible significant correlations was two hundred seventy-five. For Sao Paulo, thirty-five were significant, thirty of them positive and five of them negative.

Two variables had seven significant correlations with other variables. Coping Effectiveness in the Authority area when punished by the mother was correlated positively with Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area, Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, with the father and with friends. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated positively with Persistence and Attitude in the Task Achievement (Academic) area and negatively with Initiation in the same area. It also was correlated with Initiation and Implementation in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area, with Coping Effectiveness in the Authority area and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Three variables did not correlate significantly with any of the variables in other areas. These were Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of hobbies, and Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

Three correlations out of a possible eighteen were significant, one negative and two positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with the amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over the child's Academic Task Achievement, while Parental Initiation in Contacting School was correlated negatively with Persistence and positively with Engagement in the Task Achievement (Academic) area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

Only one correlation out of a possible twelve was significant. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parent's Occupational Aspiration for the child.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

Only one correlation out of a possible eighteen was significant. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Parent's Attitude toward Importance of School.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

Three correlations were significant, all of them negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated negatively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement, while Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively both with Parental Initiation in Contacting School and Parental Academic Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

Two correlations were significant out of twelve. Initiation in doing jobs around the house was correlated with parent's reasons for the child having these jobs, emphasis on the child's personality development receiving a high schore; while Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated with Parent's Occupational Aspiration for child.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area was correlated with Parental Attitude toward Importance of School. None of the other eighteen correlations was significant.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated negatively with Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School. None of the other fifteen correlations were significant.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x School - Table 24

Two correlations out of the fifteen were significant. Parental Conception of the major function of school was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in the Authority area for both mother and father. Looking at this in direct relation to the questions in the interview schedule, the negative correlation indicated that children whose parents stated that school was important for more than just academic or socioeconomic reasons reacted more effectively when criticized by both mother and father.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

One out of the nine correlations was significant. The ability to cope effectively when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

The ability to cope effectively when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with the parent's reason for the child having chores, while ability to get along well with other children was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration. None of the other four correlations was significant.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

One out of the six possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in contacting school.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

Only one out of a possible twelve correlations was significant. The ability to cope effectively when angry with the mother was correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 33

Only one correlation was significant out of the twelve possible. The ability to cope effectively when angry with the father was positively correlated with Parental Conception of the major function of school. Those children whose parents saw Task Achievement as the most important function coped better with aggression.

Summary

The significant relationships between the two areas proved to be small in number. Out of two hundred eight possible correlations only twenty-one were significant, thirteen of them negative and eight of them positive.

One variable had five and a second four significant correlations with other variables. Parental Initiation in contacting school was correlated positively with Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) and negatively with Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic); with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic); with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area and with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by father.

Degree of Parental Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) and negatively with Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother and with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends.

Ten of the variables did not correlate significantly with any other variable. All were in the Child Behavior area. They were Attitude and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic); Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic); Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and by father; Implementation in the Anxiety area and Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with mother and with friends.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

Three correlations out of a possible twelve were significant, all of them negative. Initiation and Attitude toward Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork, while Initiation also was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

Three correlations were significant out of twelve. Degree of Guidance by Parents in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness, Initiation and Engagement in the Task Achievement (Academic) area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

Only three out of the thirty correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area was correlated with amount of Positive Affect shown in the father-child interaction, while Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Activity Level father-child interaction. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parent in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Eight out of a possible thirty correlations were significant. Six of them were positive and two of them negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Activity Level for both mother-child and father-child interactions, with Positive Affect mother-child interaction and negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of hobbies, was correlated with Activity Level father-child interaction while Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated with positive affect father-child interaction, and degree of parental guidance in Interpersonal Relations.

Finally Degree of Guidance by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation was correlated negatively with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation. None of the other eight correlations was significant.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

Two correlations out of twenty-five were significant, one negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother was correlated with Positive Affect mother-child interaction, while Coping Effectiveness when the authority figure was the father was correlated negatively with Activity Level mother-child interaction.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother was correlated negatively with the Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety area. None of the other four correlations was significant.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

One out of the six possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

Only two out of the fifteen correlations were significant. More might have been expected, particularly between Degree of Guidance given by parents in Interpersonal Relations and the three assessments of Coping Effectiveness in the Child Behavior area. However, none of these three correlations was significant.

Coping Effectiveness, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated both with Activity Level and Positive Affect in the father-child interaction area.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated with Degree of Guidance given by parents in this area. There was no significant correlation with Implementation.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

Two out of the eight correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with the father both were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

Only one of the eight correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father was correlated with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

One of the four correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in an Anxiety situation.

Summary

Out of two hundred thirty-five correlations only twenty-nine were significant, nineteen of them positive and ten of them negative.

Three Parent Treatment variables, Activity Level father-child interaction, Degree of Guidance in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and Degree of Guidance by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation, and one Child Behavior variable, Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), correlated with four other variables.

Nine variables did not correlate with any other variables. All of these were in the Child Behavior area. They were Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), three assessments of Coping Effectiveness in the Authority area, Coping Effectiveness in the Interpersonal Relations area, Implementation in the Anxiety area and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

Three correlations were significant out of twenty-four possible correlations. All of them were positive. Mother's Coping

Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated with child's Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), both when defined by number of organized groups belonged to and by number of hobbies. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated with Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of hobbies.

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

One correlation out of twenty was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations was correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

Two correlations out of twelve were significant, both of them positive. The mother's Coping Effectiveness with Interpersonal Relations and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her friends both were correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness when his feelings are hurt by another child.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There was one negative correlation out of the eight possible. The mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated negatively with child's Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There were two significant correlations out of six, one negative and one positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Activity Level in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area and positively with Coping Effectiveness in the same area.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There was one significant correlation out of five. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

There were very few significant correlations in this area, only ten out of a possible one hundred thirty. And in fact while eleven of the variables correlated significantly, twenty of them had no significant correlations at all with other variables.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There were no significant correlations between the two types of parent behavior.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

One correlation was significant out of the eight possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by husband was correlated positively with the reason for the child having a job around the house, child's personality development receiving a high score.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area was correlated with reason for the child having a job around the house. The correlation with Parental Occupational Aspiration was not significant.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only two out of the forty possible correlations were significant. The reason for the child having a job around the house (child's personality development receiving a high score) was correlated positively with the mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband and her Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

Only one correlation out of eight was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

Two correlations out of a possible eight were significant. Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband and by her children.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

Only one correlation out of twenty was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

There was one significant correlation. Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area was correlated negatively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area was correlated negatively with Degree of Parental Guidance in the Anxiety area.

Summary

The number of significant correlations in these two areas was low, only five out of a possible fifty. Of these, three were positive and two were negative.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

One correlation out of the six possible was significant. Parental Academic and Occupational Aspirations were correlated quite highly.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

One correlation was significant out of a possible nine. Parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Parent's Conception of the major function of school, Task Achievement functions receiving a high score.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only two correlations out of a possible twenty-one were significant.

Parent Treatment of Child

There were no significant correlations between variables in the area of Task Achievement (Academic) and Task Achievement (Nonacademic) (Table 88), Interpersonal Relations (Table 89) and Anxiety (Table 90).

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

Two correlations out of a possible ten were significant, one of them negative and one of them positive. Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Activity Level father-child interaction while Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Interpersonal Relations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There was one significant correlation out of the five possible. Degree of Parental Guidance in Interpersonal Relations was correlated with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area.

Summary

Degree of Guidance by parents in Interpersonal Relations correlated with degree of guidance in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and with degree of guidance in Anxiety.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There was one significant correlation out of the six possible. Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

Two correlations were significant out of a possible fifteen. Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction, while Parental Initiation in contacting school was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework. None of the three other correlations were significant.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

Two correlations out of a possible four were significant, one negative and one positive. Reason for the child having jobs around the house was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in the same area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

Two correlations out of a possible ten were significant. The reasons for child having jobs around the house was correlated positively both with Positive Affect father-child interaction and with Degree of Guidance given by Parents in the Interpersonal Relations area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There were two significant correlations out of a possible six. Parental Attitude toward the importance of school was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork, while Parental Conception of the major function of school was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There were no significant correlations.

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were no significant correlations.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Ten out of the eighty correlations were significant, three of them negative and seven positive. Two Parent Attitude variables and three Parent Treatment variables had no significant correlations.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

When asked to describe the child in terms of his schoolwork, significantly more fathers (twenty-five percent) than mothers (eight percent) spoke in terms of neutral or average achievement.

Thirty-nine percent of mothers indicated that their child always initiated his own homework behavior but only ten percent of fathers perceived the child as doing this.

Perhaps this discrepancy was due to the father's lack of real knowledge. That they were in some doubt as to the child's homework behavior was clear from the question concerning what the child would do if he found he had been doing his homework the wrong way. While eighteen percent of mothers said they did not know, double the number of fathers gave this response.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

While there were no significant differences between mothers and fathers on Educational Aspiration for their child, a difference did occur for Educational Expectation. Twenty-three percent of mothers expected their child to reach less than high school graduate status but only five percent of fathers expected this level.

There were no significant differences on any of the occupational questions.

III. Nonacademic Activities

A significant difference in reporting occurred on the number of mother-child activities. Twenty-five percent of mothers indicated participating in four or more activities with their children. But no father reported that many activities between mother and child.

A similar type of difference occurred on the number of father-child activities. Twenty-six percent of mothers reported three father-child activities but only five percent of fathers mentioned this number.

The parents differed again on the question concerning jobs around the house. Sixteen percent of mothers but forty-eight percent of fathers reported that the child seldom or never helped with household chores.

Of those children who did have jobs around the house sixty-six percent of mothers but only forty-three percent of fathers indicated that they were jobs of a family nature only such as washing the dishes.

When the parents were asked the reason for the child having a job around the house, forty-six percent of mothers said it was to help the parents. Only fifteen percent of fathers gave this response.

Asked if the child ever got anyone else to do their jobs for them sixty-five percent of mothers answered "no" but only forty percent of fathers gave this response.

Thirty percent of mothers thought the child carried out his tasks excellently but only eight percent of fathers would agree with this. However, while only twenty-one percent of mothers reported that the child seldom helped around the house without being asked fifty-three percent of fathers reported this situation.

IV. Authority

When asked how the child responded when asked to do something forty-three percent of mothers but seventy-three percent of fathers indicated that the child did it immediately.

When they corrected a child for not doing a job the right way, twenty-one percent of mothers but forty-five percent of fathers indicated that the child accepted the correction in a positive manner while twenty-four percent of mothers but only eight percent of fathers indicated a negative acceptance such as "grumbles but does it."

No significant differences between the reports of how the child reacted to discipline or punishment from either parent occurred.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

When the child's feelings were hurt forty-five percent of mothers reported that the child reacted with depressed or anxious affect. Only twenty-five percent of fathers reported this reaction.

VII. Anxiety

Parents were asked if their child turned to others for help when worried. Thirteen percent of fathers reported that the child turned to the mother only but forty-four percent of mothers gave this response.

VIII. Aggression

There were no significant differences in this area.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

Sixty-eight percent of fathers had not met their child's teacher as compared with thirty-four percent of mothers.

While twenty percent of mothers indicated that they did nothing to encourage the child in his schoolwork forty percent of fathers said they did nothing. And while forty-eight percent of mothers gave attitudinal support only twenty-eight percent of fathers did this.

Differences also occurred between parental responses on the question of homework, forty percent of mothers indicating that they did nothing to help as it was not necessary. Only eighteen percent of fathers gave this type of response. On the other hand, thirty-three percent of fathers said they did nothing because there was some external pressure on the child which ensured that he did it. In some cases this external pressure could be the mother. Three percent of mothers gave this response.

II. Authority

Significantly more fathers (seventy-three percent) indicated that they used a mild request when they wanted their child to do something as compared to fifty-one percent of mothers.

On the question of discipline by the mother, fifteen percent said they used strong verbal methods but thirty-three percent of fathers indicated that mothers used this method. Similarly, thirty percent of mothers reported that they deprived the child of privileges but only eight percent of fathers indicated that mothers used this type of discipline.

III. Interpersonal Relations

There were no significant correlations in this area.

IV. Anxiety

There were no significant correlations in this area.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

This series of questions dealt with courses or training taken since leaving school. Thirty-nine percent of mothers and fifty-eight percent of fathers had not taken any courses since they left school. The large number of mothers taking courses is explained by the twenty-nine percent of the sample who had taken domestic courses. No father had taken such a course.

Of those who had taken courses significantly more mothers had taken them for personal and social reasons and significantly more mothers had taken these courses just after leaving school and had not finished them. Almost every parent taking a course felt that they had gained from it in some way.

II. Occupational Aspects

In Brazil, seventeen of the eighty mothers worked and all forty fathers worked. When asked how they came to be in the kind of work they were in, thirty-five percent of mothers and forty-two percent of fathers said it was because they wanted that kind of work. Into the combined rare response category fell sixty-four percent of mothers' responses and fifty-seven percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what their job was like, seventy-six percent of mothers and fifty-five percent of fathers gave a purely descriptive response. Evaluative responses were given by eleven percent of mothers and thirty-seven percent of fathers.

When asked how they felt about their job, eighty-two percent of mothers and seventy-seven percent of fathers gave positive affective responses.

When asked what they specifically liked about the job, the only category with sufficient frequency of responses was in the combined rare response category. In this category fell eighty-two percent of mothers' responses and seventy-two percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what they disliked about the job, again the only category with sufficient frequencies of responses was the combined rare response category. Falling into this category was eighty-two percent of the mothers' responses and seventy-two percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked if they would choose the same kind of work if they had it to do over, forty-seven percent of mothers and fifty-five percent of fathers said that they would. On the other hand, forty-seven percent of mothers and forty-two percent of fathers said that they would not choose the same sort of work.

When asked what they did when problems arose on the job, fifty-three percent of mothers and fifty-seven percent of fathers said they would solve it by themselves. No other categories had sufficient frequencies for analysis.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, twenty-nine percent of mothers and fifty-seven percent of fathers mentioned good social relationships or being friendly. Into the rare response category fell forty-seven percent of mothers' responses and twenty-five percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what was the best way to get along with the boss or supervisor, twenty-nine percent of mothers and fifty percent of fathers said the question was not applicable as they worked alone. Into the combined rare response category fell sixty-four percent of the mothers' responses and thirty-five percent of the fathers' responses.

III. Personal Characteristics

When parents were asked how they reacted to criticism there were a number of significant differences. Twenty-five percent of fathers and eight percent of mothers indicated they would dislike it or take it poorly.

When the person criticizing was the husband or wife twenty-one percent of mothers would take it poorly but only five percent of fathers reported this reaction.

When friends or children criticized them there was no difference in the reaction of mothers and fathers. Twenty-four percent of mothers and thirty-five percent of fathers reported that they were never criticized by their own children.

Nineteen percent of mothers and forty-three percent of fathers were angered by the annoying behavior of others or by work-related problems while ten percent of mothers and twenty-five percent of fathers were angered by actions originating in the self.

There were no significant differences in the way mothers and fathers reacted when angry.

MEXICO

INTRODUCTION

During the development of the cross-national study, it became apparent to all the participating scientists that we should have access to parents and teachers as important sources of validation criteria for the results obtained in the children. It was decided that a sub-sample of the parents of the children in the study should prove to be sufficient for the purpose, while not overtaxing the facilities of the research teams.

The criteria of selection implied a combination of random sampling and a criterion that would dichotomize the sample of children with regard to their intelligence as measured by the Raven test. The specific procedure was as follows: for each one of the eight cells of the design, the median Raven score was determined. Then, by a random procedure, five children above the median and five children below the median were chosen.

It was decided to apply the interview to all the eighty mothers in the sample but only to forty of the fathers. This was decided upon the realization that it would be much easier to contact and interview Mexican mothers than it would be to contact and receive the cooperation of the Mexican fathers. At any rate, in the final analysis there were one hundred twenty interviews completed in Mexico. It is important to indicate, however, that the fathers were not actually divided in the same random way as the mothers, since the interview with the fathers was exclusively done in those cases in which it was possible to receive cooperation from them. In all of the eighty cases the mother was questioned in regard to the possibility of interviewing the father, and when this was impossible, those male parent interviews were dropped. Because of this, the father interviews did not completely follow the dichotomous criterion as did the mother interviews. However, it was possible in all eight cells to interview five fathers per cell.

In order to contact the parents for the interview, the first thing that was done was to acquire the information about their addresses and, whenever possible, their telephone numbers. Next, whenever this was at all possible, the people were contacted by telephone in order to obtain an appointment. This procedure was successful in a few cases. The success was more common with the upper-middle parents than with the upper-lower. The more general form of contact was going to the home, as the address was entered in the school records in order to contact the mother of the child. Since the parents of the upper-lower children often lived close to the schools attended by their children, we would send interviewers into the general area in order to systematically knock on the doors of the selected cases. They then would either carry on with the interview if the mother was ready, or else establish an appointment for the interview at a later date. There were extreme cases in which it was necessary to call up to seven times at a given place before the mother could be reached. In the cases where this happened, the interviewers would try to obtain information from the neighbors regarding possible times during which they could reach the mother. This type of approach, however, seldom gave accurate information regarding the time at which one could find the mother at home. These were, however, the exceptional cases. It was frequent that the interviews would be carried out on the very first visit. This was particularly so with the mothers of the upper-lower children, who appeared always more willing and condescending than the mothers in the upper-middle class. In the cases when it was not possible to obtain the interview on the first visit, an appointment was made for a second one. Again, the number of times that this had to be done was significantly greater with the upper-middle class than with the upper-lower class parents. From the very first personal contact with the mother she was asked about the possibilities of also interviewing her husband. Such an opportunity turned out frequently to be a difficult one. Often in the upper-lower class, the fathers could be interviewed only after working hours, and they would, at those particular times, be bored and tired and not very willing to see anybody. Also, in the upper-lower class, significantly more often than in the upper-middle class, the father would visit the home only once a week, and in one case only once per month. This, of course, created difficulty. In some of these cases, the interview of the father had to be abandoned because of the actual inability of finding him for the interview. In the upper-middle class the problem regarding the fathers was the fact that they were always busy. The mothers would sometimes indicate that it was probably difficult if not impossible to get the father for an interview. One of the ways in which these problems were frequently solved was after the mother had explained very thoroughly the nature of the interview to the father. The interviewer would finally get an appointment with the father at his place of work.

The question of where the families lived, and the description of the areas in which the lived, is not easily answered. Mexico City is a large mosaic, in which -- although it is true that the people in the upper-middle and upper economic classes live in residential zones in which there are much more often than not large houses with attractive architectural features and gardens -- upper-lower and even low-class housing may be found interspersed, frequently in the same block or between the blocks of residential houses. However, for our own specific sample, there is one clear difference. While the upper-middle parents were widely dispersed in a large number of residential areas like Pedregal de San Angel, Lomas de Chapultepec, Polanco, Anzures, Ciudad Satelite, Colonia del Valle, etcetera, the parents in the upper-lower tended to be clustered fairly closely around the schools attended by their children. This of course indicated that the upper-middle class parents were capable of transporting their children fairly far from their living quarters, while the upper-lower oftentimes were economically unable to do so, and tended to send their children to the closest state school available. The range of areas where these schools for the upper-lower children were located is very great, both topologically (since they would be found just as often in the north as in the south or in the west or in the east of the city, as it would be regarding the appearance of the zone) from very worker-like housing urban zones, made up of small, one-story houses to areas where there is a combination of low class and middle class and even upper class housing.

All parents, regardless of sex and social class, once they accepted the interview, showed themselves cooperative and tended to respond directly and spontaneously to the questions. This was, however, significantly more so with the upper-lower group. Generally, too, the mothers answered more willingly, although more passively, than the fathers. It may be interesting to add, since this was often commented by the interviewers, that the mothers in families where the fathers were not living consistently at their homes tended to insist upon indicating that their husbands were wonderful men but that their frequent absences from their homes were due to economic reasons since their jobs demanded their absences. In a typical Mexican wife's way of expression, they would indicate how much their husbands had to sacrifice themselves in order to keep the home on its economic feet. Actual refusals occurred only twice in the entire sample. In these cases the refusal was extremely clear and insultingly direct. There were at the most two other cases where the parents refused the interview. It was probably not more than four or five percent of the entire population that refused for some reason or another to answer. However, it was necessary to substitute up to ten percent of the interviews originally sampled. The rest of these failures were due to inability to find the addresses of the parents, or in some cases families where there was no father. As indicated in previous lines, the general attitude of the parents with regard to the interview was one of acceptance, sometimes resigned acceptance, since they had been reasonably convinced that what we were doing had to do with matters connected with the education of their children. However, in most cases, the cooperation was open and decided, and there was much interest shown in the questions that were asked. Sometimes, too, the parents would seek further information about the study and the reason for the entire project from the interviewers. These questions were usually answered at the end of the interview. There was greater passivity, as well as a more spontaneous and trusting reacting from the mothers in the upper-lower than from the mothers of the upper-middle class. The latter appeared slightly more inquisitive and even slightly suspicious. However, all mothers ended the interview with a feeling of trust and friendliness toward the interviewers. The fathers were in general more active, a little bit more distrustful, and they showed more restlessness and some amount of nervousness when they were questioned and often interrupted the interviewers to ask the reasons for a given question or the reasons for the entire interview and even for the purposes and reasons of the research. This particular trend was certainly more common in the upper-middle class fathers than in the upper-lower class ones.

If one combines the paucity of research in the behavioral sciences in Mexico with the even greater paucity of information about what is being done, it will not sound strange to say that there has been only one other study in which parents were interviewed with the same amount of care and with the same degree of success in Mexico. This was done by almost the same team of researchers as were utilized in the cross-national. The interviews were connected with the cross-cultural longitudinal study of cognitive and personality development of school children that R. Diaz-Guerrero conducted in collaboration with Dr. Wayne H. Holtzman from the University of Texas. In that study, about two years prior (1965-1966) to the cross-national interviews, about two hundred parents were interviewed. The interview was a modification from the original interview by Wolf, et. al. In this interview there was particular concentration on a number of criteria that might have to do with the cognitive, personality and intellectual development of the children. Furthermore, it included two attitude questionnaires, in order to inquire into the philosophy of training of the children. This entire study was completed and the results have been analyzed but it has not as yet been published. The pattern of difficulties and percent of cooperation in that study was very similar to the present one. There was in Mexico, of course, the semi-literary studies of Oscar Lewis and his five families. There was also one early study, by one of our students, Josefina Convers Vergara, in which about twenty-five families from the lowest class in Mexico City were interviewed during the illness of one of their children. In this study the interview was much less sophisticated and there were several other instruments utilized in getting the information. The goal of that particular study was to see the reaction of the parents during a situation of stress being produced by the presence of illness in the family. In this study Convers Vergara got one hundred percent cooperation from the mothers.

All the interviewers in this cross-national study were members of the research team from the Centro de Investigaciones en Ciencias del Comportamiento which grew within the Centro Electronico de Calculo of the National University of Mexico and has been under the direction of R. Diaz-Guerrero. The first interviewers were those that had previous training in interviewing from the cross-cultural study mentioned previously. The plan for the training of others consisted of giving them some readings in interviewing first. Secondly, they accompanied the trained interviewers on three or four occasions, and then they gave the interviews under the supervision of the trained interviewer for two or three more times. Finally, they did their own interviewing. All of the interviewers were advanced undergraduates, graduate students, or recently graduated professional psychologists from the Colegio de Psicologia of the National University of Mexico. Every completed interview was examined by the interviewer and at least one other interviewer and sometimes by Maria Luisa Morales also, in order to check the answers and ask about some of the ways of answering and the way the interviewers had recorded the answers, and so forth. The original interviewers for the IDPEM (the previously cited research) were trained with observation through one-way screens at the old laboratories of the Colegio de Psicologia of the National University of Mexico.

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

About sixty-five percent of all the children in the sample lived with both their parents only. However, an additional thirty percent lived with either both parents or one parent plus either relatives or non-relatives. This left only three children who lived with one parent alone in the total sample. Neither sex nor age made a difference with regard to these categories but it was found that with respect to social class, the sub-category of one or two parents plus relatives was clearly higher in the upper-lower group, with thirty percent compared with the upper-middle, where there were only eight percent in this category. This difference corresponds well with what is known from experience. In Mexico there is a class of individual, usually a relative, who is called "el arrimado" and lives with the family. The arrimado is of course apart from the tendency to have a parent or parents of one of the spouses living with the family. It was clear from these results that this phenomenon is far more common for the upper-lower class than for the upper-middle in Mexico City.

With regard to the question "Who is mainly responsible for the child?" the most important finding is that (depending on the classifying group) whereas from fifty to seventy percent of all children in the sample the mother is mainly responsible, only in from zero to eight percent of the sample (as divided by the variables in the analysis) were these children for whom the father was mainly responsible. However, as a Mexican child advances in age from ten to fourteen, the main responsibility befalls both parents, since at ten only thirteen percent of the children were classified in this category while by fourteen, thirty-eight percent, wholly one-third of the sample, was in this subcategory. This was the only significant difference in the Chi-Square analysis. It would be of much interest to postulate the hypothesis that as age increases in Mexico, the main responsibility befalls both parents following a positively accelerated curve.

Only thirty-eight percent of the mothers were born in Mexico City. Another eighteen percent were born in an adjacent state and about thirty-eight percent were born in a different state. Significantly more upper-lower mothers (twenty-five percent) were born in an adjacent state than upper-middle mothers (three percent). Unexpectedly, eight percent of all the mothers were born in a different country. None were born in the same state, but a different city, because Mexico City is the Federal District, and there is no possibility of another city within the same state.

Again, regarding the birthplace of the father, the only significant difference was found between the upper-lower and the upper-middle with regard to birth in an adjacent state, with twenty-three percent of the upper-lower fathers being born there and only five percent of the upper middle. About forty-three percent of the fathers were born in Mexico City, thirty-five percent in the same country but in a distant state, and fourteen percent in an adjacent state to the Federal District. Finally, about five percent of the sample of the fathers were born in a different country.

Question nine referred to the age of the mother. The subcategories for this question showed a range in the age of the mother from twenty-five to sixty-five or over. Interestingly, the age of the child does not significantly vary with the age of the mother. Sex does not affect it either but interestingly, social class does. There is a defined and significant trend for the whole table to show that the mothers of upper-lower children are younger than the mothers of upper-middle children, across all the subcategories. There were significantly more forty-five to forty-nine year old mothers for the upper-middle (twenty-three percent) than for the upper-lower (five percent).

The age of the father was not related to the sex of the children in our sample. However, it varied very clearly with the age and to some extent with the social class.

There were significantly more twenty-five to thirty-nine year-old parents (forty percent) for the ten-year-old than for the fourteen-year-old (eight percent). Over the whole table there was a significant trend for ten-year-olds to have younger fathers and fourteen-year-olds to have older fathers. Regarding the social class, there was also a trend for the upper-middle fathers to be older than the upper-lower; however, the trend reached significance only for the twenty-five to thirty-nine year-old fathers with thirty-eight percent of them belonging to the upper-lower class and only four percent in the upper-middle. It may be of interest to discover if this difference in the age favoring the parents of the upper-middle children has anything to do with the difference in performance between the upper-middle and the upper-lower.

Fully eighty-three percent of the mothers in the sample did not have a paid occupation. This high percentage was pretty much the same across age, sex, and social class.

The results with regard to fathers' occupation simply demonstrate statistically that the selection for the sample was done as it should have been. That is to say, there are no differences whatsoever with regard to the age or the sex of the children, but there are extremely large and significant differences for the entire table regarding social class and for the subcategories that should show this difference.

Regarding mothers' education, although no attempt was made to select the sample with difference in education or occupation for the mothers, it was very interesting to see that there were no differences whatsoever for the age and sex variables, but that again, both for the entire table and for some subcategories the difference in the mothers' education, across the social classes was highly significant, indicating that for all subcategories, the upper-lower had smaller percentages of high level education and larger percentages of low level education.

The significant results for fathers' education again simply demonstate clearly the accuracy of the sample selection for social class. There were absolutely no significant differences with regard to the fathers' education for the variables of sex and age.

Half of the sample (fifty percent) had lived in their present home for eleven years or more and thirty-three percent had lived there at least five years. Our sample appeared to be very stable ecologically speaking. This finding was particularly significant in view of the fact that about seventy-three percent of the sample had been living either in the same place or in the same place plus just one other ever since the birth of the child in the sample. Furthermore, there was no difference in this regard between the ten-year-olds and the fourteen-year-olds.

Sixty-six percent of the children in the sample had never been in a hospital. It is interesting to point out that more males (thirty-five percent) than females (eighteen percent) had been in the hospital once. However, in most cases, with very rare exceptions, the children had been in the hospital less than three days.

Finally, regarding absences from home for as long as six months, of the father or the mother or both, it was found that none of the mothers had ever been away for six months from the children. On the other hand, fifteen percent of the fathers had been away this amount of time. There was only one case in the sample in which both parents were away for six months.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

The questions in this section were aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his mode of tackling academic problems as perceived by the mother.

According to the view of the mothers, twenty-two percent of the children in the sample were doing either excellently or quite well in school, close to forty percent were doing average work and only four percent admitted that their children were doing badly. Thirty-four percent of the mothers in the sample answered irrelevantly to the matter of achievement, indicating either positive or negative attitudes of the child toward the school or situational problems.

About forty percent of the mothers felt that their children had from positive to strong positive feelings, seven percent had neutral feelings and about ten percent had from negative to strongly negative feelings toward the school. Again, about twenty-three percent of the mothers responded with something other than a feeling toward the school, e.g., descriptive statements such as "He or she takes it seriously" or "He thinks it is a game." This, more than descriptive statements as they were codified, appeared to be attitudes about the schoolwork.

Intrinsic values such as "He likes to learn" and specific subjects such as Mathematics, Biology, and so forty, were reported to be the child's feelings toward school in thirty-two percent of the cases. Personal characteristics such as "He is keen to do well" or "He is lazy" accounted for twenty-two percent, and statements of the value of the school for self-improvement for eighteen percent of responses.

According to the mother, twenty percent did excellently, thirty-four percent above average, thirty percent average and only nine percent below average or poor at school. It certainly appeared as though Mexican mothers were in general over-protective and their opinions of their children optimistic.

Forty percent of the children did their homework at a specific regular time every day, and, according to their mothers, ninety-six percent of them got it done in one way or another.

Aside from differences connected with age, sex and social class, fifty-eight percent of the children did their homework wholly on their own initiative. Another eighteen percent with a little push or help to shart carry on, and twenty percent gave conditions such as "own room" or "radio on."

Frequently or always twenty-five percent of the children put off their homework to do other things before they got to it, but fifty-two percent did this seldom or never and twenty-two percent sometimes. According to the mother, if the child found when he had finished his homework that he had done it incorrectly, forty-eight percent would just start all over again, another twenty-two percent would do likewise but show unhappiness or anger, and about twenty-two percent would redo it for various other reasons. Only ten percent would not do it at all again.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Age affected strongly a number of the questions regarding academic task achievement. The fourteen-year-olds showed significantly more positive feelings (fifty percent versus twenty percent) and significantly less negative feelings than the ten-year-old (fifteen percent versus five percent).

As to the reasons for the feelings toward school, fourteen-year-olds significantly more often based their liking for school on intrinsic values and specific likings for academic subjects (fifty-three percent) than did ten-year-olds (ten percent). They also based their feelings toward school more often on personal characteristics (thirty-three percent) than did the ten-year-olds (thirteen percent). Again, as to how the children did at school, a significant difference occurred for the whole table indicating that the fourteen-year-olds tended to do excellently and above average, while the ten-year-olds tended to do more average, below average and poor work. As to the style of doing homework there was a difference in the placing of conditions in order to do the work. Here the fourteen-year-olds more often placed conditions on the work (thirty percent) than did the ten-year-olds (ten percent). There were no differences in the degree of self-initiation or other-initiation between the ten- and the fourteen-year-olds for Mexico. This might be another way of looking at the slow development of individual initiative.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Regarding the reasons for the feelings that the children had about the school, it was found that while twenty-eight percent of the upper-lower children felt the way they did toward school because of reasons connected with the opportunity for self-improvement, only eight percent of the upper-middle were found in this subcategory. The only other significant differences regarding social class were found in the manner of going about doing the homework. Significantly more upper-lower (seventy percent) than upper-middle (forty-five percent) did their work on their own initiative, while significantly more upper-middle mentioned conditions (thirty percent) to do their work than did upper-lower children (ten percent).

3. Sex

For some reason, the mothers made significantly fewer references to when the work got done for the girls (forty-three percent) than for the boys (eighteen percent). Almost significantly so, girls also were seen as not having a regular or specific time for homework; only twenty eight percent of them did, while fifty percent of boys had a regular time. These last two findings may be easily explained in the light of the fact that girls had to do other things at the home which were not required of the boys and which were connected with meals and other household chores. Finally, according to the mothers, more girls (thirty percent) than boys (ten percent) put conditions as to when they were going to do their homework.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

With regard to the question "How far would you like your child to go in school?" sixty-five percent of the mothers said they would like their children to obtain a university degree or at least some university work. At the opposite extreme, only two percent would like for their children to complete less than eight grades in school. Nine percent would like for them to complete the Mexican Preparatory school and thirteen percent to complete the Mexican Secundaria or junior high school. Eight percent of them pointed out that they felt that it depended on either the child's preference or on his capacity as to how far he should go.

To the question "How far do you think he will really go in school?" forty-three percent of the mothers still felt that he would get a university degree or some university work, fourteen percent felt that he would complete the preparatory school, seventeen percent the secundaria and five percent less than the eighth grade. Still, ten percent of the mothers insisted upon the fact that it would depend upon their child's preferences and capacities.

To the question "What particular type of job or occupation would you like to see your child take up when he is grown?" forty percent wanted to see them become professional people, business managers, government department heads, et cetera. Eight percent preferred jobs such as accountant, office manager, medican or insurance sales agent, twenty-one percent preferred jobs of the level of traveling salesman, bank clerk, bookkeeper, small business owner, and non one wanted to see them as servants, watchmen or street cleaners.

To the question "What kind of occupation would you not like to see your child take up when he is grown?" nine percent had no restrictions whatsoever as to the kind of job that he would like the child to take up. Expressions like "Never thought about it" or "No job that I will not want him to do" were common. Nineteen percent did object to specific professions like architect, priest, lawyer, et cetera. Twenty percent objected to low status jobs like common laborer, twenty-eight percent to specific occupations like secretary or midwife, ten percent to jobs not suited to the temperamental capacities or abilities of the child, and seven percent to illegal or immor activities or low-class entertainers.

To the question "What type of work do you feel he would like to do when he grows up?" twenty-six percent saw them becoming professional people or high executives, ten percent saw them at the level of office manager, et cetera, thirty-three percent at the level of bank clerk, small business owner, bookkeeper, traveling salesman, and twelve percent saw them at the level of carpenter, mechanic, electrician. And finally, to the question of what type of work the child probably will do when grown, again twenty-five percent saw them at the highest category of occupation, three percent on the second highest, twenty-three percent at the middle level occupation, five percent at the level of the mechanic and carpenter and the largest percent, thirty-six percent, indicated that they had never thought about it, and actually, had no preference.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Understandably, there were differences by age regarding "How far do you think that he really will go in school?" Thus the mothers of the fourteen-year-old more often (fifty-eight percent) than the mothers of the ten-year-old (thirty-eight percent) considered that their children would go as far as becoming university graduates or at least have some amount of university education. Understandably too, more mothers of fourteen-year-olds (twenty-three percent) than mothers of ten-year-olds (five percent) felt that they would complete the Preparatory school. Contrariwise, twenty-five percent of the mothers of ten-year-olds felt that their children would only complete the ninth grade as opposed to eight percent of the mothers of the fourteen-year-olds. As a matter of fact, the whole table with these percentages showed a highly significant difference indicating that, in general, the mothers of the fourteen-year-olds felt far more often than the mothers of the ten-year-olds that their children would go farther in their education.

2. Socioeconomic Status

More upper-lower mothers (thirty-five percent) objected to low status jobs than upper-middle mothers (five percent). More upper-middle mothers (thirty-eight percent) saw their children having a profession as the job they would like when grown than did upper-lower mothers (fifteen percent). Finally again on the type of work that the child would probably do when grown, realistically more upper-middle mothers (thirty-five percent) saw them as professionals or engaged in the highest occupations than did upper-lower mothers (fifteen percent).

3. Sex

Expectedly, it was in regard to the sex breakdown that the largest number of significant differences with regard to occupational and educational aspirations were found. With regard to "How far would you like your child to go in school?" while eighty percent of the mothers wanted their boys to have a university degree, only fifty percent wanted their daughters to go that far. On "How far do you think he will actually go?" fifty-eight percent of the mothers of the boys felt they would obtain a university degree, while only twenty-eight percent of the mothers of the girls felt so. Actually, the whole table for this particular question showed a highly significant difference indicating that the higher the educational goal the higher percentage of mothers who thought their boys would attain it, and the lower the percentage of mothers who thought that their girls would attain it, and just the opposite for the lower educational levels. Thus, with regard to completing only junior high school, twenty-five percent of the mothers of girls and three percent of mothers of boys reported this way.

Fifty-five percent of the mothers would like their sons to have the highest occupational level when grown, while only twenty-five percent would like their daughters to do likewise. On the contrary, on occupations of the third level, schoolteacher, bank clerk, etcetera, more mothers (thirty-five percent) would like to see their daughters obtain this level than their sons (eight percent). Perhaps out of sheer number of possibilities of achieving a profession, more mothers (thirty three percent) objected to a particular profession for the boys than for the girls (five percent). The contrary happened, probably for the same reason, in the middle level status occupation, where the mothers were more opposed to a specific occupation for the girls (forty-three percent) than for the boys (thirteen percent).

With regard to the type of job they thought the child would like to have when grown up, they saw thirty-eight percent of the boys liking the professional and highest occupations, as compared to fifteen percent of the girls, while on occupations of the third level (nurses, bank clerks, primary school teachers), clearly female-type activities in Mexico, they saw fifty-five percent of the girls liking to have these types of jobs and only ten percent of the boys.

Finally, under the question "What realistically do you feel your child will do when grown up?" and probably answering realistically too, they again saw the boys significantly more in the highest occupations and the girls significantly more in the middle level occupations. This is felt to be a valid statement of the level of aspirations of the mothers for their children, and it likely reflects itself in the aspirations of the children themselves.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

When outside school, fifty-six percent of children engaged in three or more different activities. All the others engaged in one or two. In activities indulged in with the parents, fourteen percent of these consisted of conversation, twenty-four percent of them in nonworking, playful activities, plus merely having fun together and positive affect, forty-two percent working together, cleaning the house, washing the dishes, and only four percent in activities that implied negative affect or absence of interaction such as "don't like each other," "fight," "ignore each other." To the question "What sorts of things does he do with his father?" twenty percent of the answers consisted of nonworking, positive affective activities such as going to the shop, playing ball, enjoying ourselves, having fun, etcetera. Fourteen percent held conversations together, sixteen percent shared activities such as work, mowing the lawn, washing the car, building something, and for thirty-three percent the activity was negative, or there was lack of interaction, as exemplified by "We don't get along," "do nothing," "are never together."

To the question "What kinds of things does he do with the family?" the mothers indicated the following distribution: thirteen percent household activities and doing nothing in particular, twenty-two percent television or listening to music, twenty-eight percent outings together such as sporting events, movies, museums, eating out and twenty-two percent absence of interaction, to mention just the higher percentages. Two percent of the children belonged to organized groups like scouts, YMCA, twenty-nine percent to sport clubs, and sixty-seven percent to no groups.

To the question "Does he have any hobbies, lessons or classes?" thirteen percent took lessons in music or art, fourteen percent in academic subjects or foreign language study, twenty-four percent sports and forty percent none. To the question "What jobs or chores does he have around the house?" the mothers indicated that twelve percent help in bedmaking, one percent in dishwashing, nine in cleaning the house, sixteen percent in washing windows, laundry, shoe cleaning, caring for children, seven percent in car washing, gardening, pets, thirty-five percent in general help, shoping particularly, and that nineteen percent seldom or never helped.

To the question "What are the reasons to give the children chores?" mothers responded in the following fashion: eight percent, to help the parents, three percent because it had to be done, thirty-two percent to teach them responsibility, twenty-six so that they will learn skills, 1.5 percent because "they want to do it," and nine percent to keep the child occupied.

Seventy-five percent of the mothers had to check always that the child did the chores. The remaining fourth, seldom or never. Fifty-three percent of the children did not try to get others to do these chores for them, but twenty-three percent tried to get their younger siblings to do the chores. In Mexico they never tried to get the parents to do chores for them, but about ten percent of the time they tried with a non-relative, often a peer.

Only three percent of the children did an excellent job of their chores while thirty-two percent did a good job, forty-two percent a satisfactory one, and ten percent a poor or very poor job. Finally, with regard to "How often did they offer their help without being asked?" thirty-two percent reported that the child always or frequently did, twenty-four percent sometimes, twenty-seven percent seldom and eighteen percent never.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

In general, fourteen-year-olds had less hobbies, lessons or classes than ten-year-olds. With regard to recreational hobbies and sports, while thirty-five percent of the ten-year-olds excercised them, only thirteen percent of the fourteen-year-olds did. Fifty-eight percent of the fourteen-year-olds had none, while only twenty-three percent of the ten-year-olds were in the same category.

As for the reasons for assigning home chores to the children, to teach them responsibility accounted for forty-five percent in the ten-year-old sample but only for eighteen percent in the fourteen-year-old sample. By this time, the parents had already taught responsibility to their child or they had given up.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The things that the child did with the mother varied with the social class. "Nonworking activity plus positive affect" appeared in thirty-five percent in the upper-middle class and only in thirteen percent in the upper-lower class. On the contrary, constructive activity, working together, etcetera, appeared in fifty-eight percent in the upper-lower and in only twenty-five percent in the upper-middle class. Also the things the children do with their father changed with social class. Go to the shop, play ball, plus positive affect, appeared more often in the upper-middle class (thirty percent), than the upper-lower class (ten percent). The same difference as with mothers appeared regarding working together, since in the upper-lower class thirty percent did this with their fathers, while in the upper-middle only ten percent did so. There were some differences also in "What things does the child do with the family?" In the upper-middle class, forty-five percent of the children went on outings together with the parents, while only ten percent of the upper-lower did so. Furthermore, thirty-three percent of the time there was no interaction for the upper-lower class, while this happened in only ten percent of cases in the upper-middle.

As might be expected because of the expense involved, while forty-eight percent of the upper-middle children belonged to sport clubs only ten percent of the upper-lower did so, and eighty-eight percent of the upper-lower belonged to no groups or organizations, while only forty-five percent of the upper-middle were in this subcategory. As might be expected, while fifty-five percent of the upper-lower children had no hobbies, lessons or classes, only twenty-five percent of the upper-middle were in this subcategory. Furthermore, while thirty percent of the upper-middle children helped in caring for children, washing windows, laundry, et cetera, only three percent of the upper-lower did so, but these percentages are refersed with regard to general help, particularly shopping, since here fifty-five percent of the upper-lower children helped, while fifteen percent of the upper-middle did so.

3. Sex

As expected, many more girls joined their mothers in constructive activities working together (fifty-five percent), than did boys (twenty-eight percent). Also, as expected in Mexico, many more boys joined their fathers in working together (thirty-five percent) than did girls (five percent). In outings with the family many more girls (forty percent) participated than did boys (fifteen percent). Seventy-eight percent of the girls did not belong to any club, organization or group. This was significantly more than the fifty-five percent for the boys. In this again the girls belonged in the home and not outside. Naturally, thirty-eight percent of the boys participated in sports, while only one percent of the girls did so. Far more often the girls were called upon to carry out the chores in the household, in order to learn skills, than were the boys (forty-five percent for the girls and only eight percent for the boys). This certainly reinforced the division of roles in the Mexican family.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

There was a series of questions in the interview in which the parents were asked how they would command their children to do something for them, and the way the children would react to this command, as well as how they watched over the child to see what he does. There was a question also with regard to what they do if they realize that the child is not doing the things the way they asked him to do. The question, the answer for which will now be described, is "How does the child react to the statement from the mother that he is not doing things right?" Twenty-three percent of the children reacted with positive acceptance ("tries to improve"). Nine percent of the children showed neutral acceptance, ten percent negative acceptance ("grumbles but he does it") and one percent refused. Twenty-eight percent developed an emotional reaction, laughed or got upset. Finally, fourteen reacted according to the mood at the time.

In response to a punishment from the mother, thirty-four percent of the children showed positive acceptance ("takes it well," "apologizes" or "discusses it rationally"). Nineteen percent showed no overt reaction, or remained quiet. Twelve percent cried and thirty percent showed hostile verbal or nonverbal behavior.

To "What does he do after punishment by the father?" it was found that thirty-two percent took it well, apologized and discussed it rationally, fourteen percent showed no overt reaction or remained quiet, twenty percent cried and fifteen percent showed hostile verbal or nonverbal behavior.

To criticism, twenty-eight percent of the children reacted with positive acceptance or apologized, four percent remained quiet, fifteen percent cried, twenty-two percent got angry, and fifteen percent laughed it off or ignored it.

When the father was the one that criticized, ten percent showed positive acceptance or apologized, sixteen percent became quiet, fourteen percent cried, fifteen percent got angry, nine percent laughted it off or ignored it, five percent became defensive verbally, and twenty-one percent of the fathers did not criticize.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

More fourteen-year-olds than ten-year-olds were reported as responding immediately to parental request (sixty percent as compared to fifty-five percent).

There was a difference in age regarding the reaction to punishment which showed that while forty-five percent of the fourteen-year-olds took the punishment well, apologized and discussed it, only eighteen percent of the ten-year-olds did so.

There was a difference by age which showed that in response to criticism, twenty-five percent of the ten-year-olds cried while only five percent of the fourteen-year-olds did so.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was a difference regarding social class as forty-eight percent of the upper-middle class children as forty-eight percent of the upper-middle reacted by taking criticism well, apologizing and discussing it rationally, while only twenty percent of upper-lower children did so. There was a trend in the full table for the upper-lower class to show more sulking, withdrawing, crying, and hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior as well as more quiet behavior than the upper-middle children.

Thirty-five percent of the fathers in the upper-middle class and eight percent of fathers in the upper-lower class did not criticize their child.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

It is actually useless to make any description of the results of the jobs of the children outside the home, since only three percent of the ten-year-olds and ten percent of the fourteen-year-olds had a job outside the home. This fact was in itself interesting. It may be added that all the jobs were held by boys and that eight percent were held by upper-lower class children and five percent by the upper-middle class.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

Seventy percent of the children in the sample had strong reactions when brothers, sisters or other children criticized them. Twenty-three percent of the children in the sample got along very well or excellently with other children. Six percent got along averagely well and fourteen percent not very well.

Friends had no influence upon the behavior of the children according to the mother in fifty-eight percent of the cases. In twelve percent of the cases, there was a general influence, and this was good. In sixteen percent of the cases the influence was neither good nor bad and in four percent of the cases it was considered to be a bad general influence.

When someone hurt their feelings, fourteen percent of the children ignored them or withdrew from the situation. Forty-six percent, however, reacted with negative or depressed affect, twenty-five percent with hostile affect plus verbal hostility plus sometimes physical aggression, and five percent with stoical acceptance or cognitive coping.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

That the influence of friends was neither good nor bad was more common for the ten-year-olds (twenty-eight percent) than for the fourteen-year-olds (five percent).

There was a large age difference with regard to negative depressed affect as a reaction when someone hurts the feelings of the children. The fourteen-year-olds reacted in this manner only thirty-three percent of the time, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the time for the ten-year-olds.

2. Socioeconomic Status

No influence whatsoever by friends was more common in the upper-middle class (seventy percent) than in the upper-lower class (forty-three percent).

VII. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

"When the child gets worried, what does he do about it?" This was a question for the mothers. Their answers were: twenty-two percent "talks to someone"; twenty-four percent "gets depressed," "loses control," and "hostile affect"; fifteen percent tried to figure out what happened; eight percent tried to remain calm, prevent display of feelings; five percent withdrew; fourteen percent didn't do anything, just sat there or didn't talk.

Problems connected with school worried sixty-four percent of the children. Only five percent worried about war and death, nineteen percent worried about family problems and four percent were self-concerned; while seven percent worried about youth problems, such as peer relationships, getting fat, or making the team. When the children had worries, thirty-two percent of them did not turn to anyone else for help, thirty-five percent turned to the mother for help, thirteen percent turned to the father or both parents for help, and thirteen percent turned to peers or siblings.

b. Significant Differences

3. Sex

There was a significant difference as to whom boys and girls turned when they were worried. Thus, while forty-four percent of the boys did not turn to anybody for help when they were worried, only eighteen percent of the girls showed this behavior. The girls went with their worries to all other people that the boys went also, but in slightly greater percentages.

VIII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

To the question "What kinds of things make your child angry?" sixty-four percent were reported as being made angry by common annoyances such as "his brother comes in his room," "someone calls him a bad name"; and ten percent by major grievances such as "people are cruel to him," "he is taken advantage of," "he is cheated or lied to." Parental authority accounted for only eleven percent of the kinds of things that made him angry ("has to do the dishes," "has to practice the piano," "can't go to the show"). Finally was his own behavior, for instance when he did something bad, broke something, got into trouble, which accounted for only one percent of the cases.

When angry, these children exhibited a large variety of actions. They withdrew ("goes to his room," "leaves the house") twenty-one percent of the time, nineteen percent of the time they vented their hostility verbally ("curses someone out," "tells him he is mad," "talks back"). Sixteen percent of the time they showed physical aggression against another person, animal or inanimate objects ("takes it out on the dog," "kicks the wall," "starts a fight"). Thirteen percent of the time there was no action or affect of any sort ("doesn't speak," "forgets it," "doesn't mind"). Equally often there was open rebellion. Twelve percent of the time there was depressed or anxious affect ("cries," "gets sad," "feels terrible"). Ten percent of the time he controlled his anger, coped actively, tried to calm down, counted to ten, etcetera.

When the anger was directed toward the mother, the behavior was again extremely variable. In this fashion, nineteen percent withdrew, went away, went to their room. Twenty-five percent, the largest number, responded with no action or affect, did nothing, just listened, didn't speak, didn't sulk or pout. Eleven percent was verbal aggression ("tells her how mad he is," "tells her off," "talks back," "curses"). Ten percent tried to control their feelings, to resolve the misunderstanding, to accept the blame. Eight percent showed behavioral rebellion, didn't obey, revolted, refused to eat, etcetera. Seven percent showed negative depressive reaction, felt sad, cried.

When the children got angry with the father, the behavior was not so varied. The largest percentage did nothing, just listened, didn't speak, didn't sulk or pout (twenty-five percent). The second largest percentage (twenty-two percent) never or seldom got angry with the father. Eighteen percent withdrew, went away, left the room, went to their room. Seven percent accepted blame, "loves us even more," understood, obeyed anyway, and only one or two percent showed negative emotional reactions, hostile reactions or behavioral rebellion. This was a beautiful picture of the amount of power that the father has and the amount of respect and obedience that the Mexican child tended to show.

When a friend was angry at him, the largest percent of the behavior (thirty percent) involved either leaving the friend's presence or getting another friend. Fourteen percent of the mothers confessed that they didn't know how the child would react, another fourteen percent indicated that the child "ignored him," "did nothing," "doesn't get mad," "becomes silent." Thirteen percent tried to reinstate the friendship, tried to get the friend to play, called them out and invited them over, etcetera. Ten percent reacted with hostility.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

The whole table of aggressive behavior breaks down with a significant difference in such a way that there tended to be more withdrawal, hostile or aggressive affect, active control of anger, and verbal expression of hostility in the fourteen-year-old than in the ten-year-old sample, while there was more depressed or anxious affect and a desire for physical aggression in the ten-year-old sample. The largest difference in this kind of behavior was precisely with regard to physical aggression with twenty-eight percent of the ten-year-olds showing this behavior and only five percent of the fourteen-year-olds doing so.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was a social class difference with regard to the reaction when angry toward the father. While thirty-three percent of the upper-middle children never or seldom got angry with the father, only ten percent of the upper-lower showed this type of behavior.

There was a significant difference in which forty percent of the children of the upper-lower class went away or went home or got another friend, while only twenty percent of the upper-middle children indulged in this kind of behavior when a friend was angry with them.

More mothers of upper-lower children did not know what their child's reaction to an angry friend would be (twenty-three percent compared to five percent).

3. Sex

There was also a breakdown in the frequencies for sex, the main differences in the behavior by sex appeared in the verbal expression or hostility with twenty-eight percent of the females doing this compared with only eight percent of the males and almost exactly the opposite appeared for physical aggression with twenty-eight percent of the males showing this kind of behavior compared with only five percent of the females.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When the parents were questioned with regard to their degree of satisfaction with the child's progress in school, fifty-five percent indicated satisfaction with positive affect, thirty-eight percent gave no indication of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and seven percent indicated dissatisfaction and negative affect.

Eighteen percent did nothing to encourage the child in his school work, sixteen percent only about his homework, and only ten percent supported his school interests with books, encyclopedias, et cetera, twenty percent preferred direct action such as rewards and punishments, and thirty-five percent, the largest single group, told him to study so that he will have a better life or used other homilies. Twenty-eight percent never met their children's teacher. Twenty percent had done so on routine formal occasions, forty percent had done it on the parents' initiative and five percent on initiative from the school.

To "What do you do to get the child to do the homework?" checking and observing accounted for fifty-five percent of responses. External pressures, verbal reminding, and nothing, or "not necessary" divided fairly evenly the rest of the parental action. To the question "What is the job of the school" fifty-four percent of the mothers answered plainly that they did not know what was the school's responsibility, seventeen percent simply said to educate, and fourteen percent indicated that it was to prepare for life and a job. To the question "How important is school?" forty-three percent of the mothers indicated that it was most important, fifty two percent that it was very important, five percent that it was important, and none considered it unimportant or worthless.

To the question "Why is the school important?" the mothers became far more cogent and sixty-eight percent of them indicated clearly that it was the best preparation for life, while twenty-two percent indicated that it was most important for personal development.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Seventy percent of the parents indicated satisfaction plus positive affect with the degree of progress in school of their fourteen-year-olds as compared to only forty percent of the parents of the ten-year-olds. As to the encouragement of the child to do his homework, there was a difference regarding the subcategory of "Yes, unspecified" or "only on his homework." Here, twenty-five percent of the parents of ten-year-olds gave this type of encouragement, while only eight percent of the parents of the fourteen year-olds did so. The number of parents using homilies to encourage schoolwork increased with the age of the child. These were used on fifty percent of the fourteen-year-olds but for only twenty percent of the ten-year-olds. Far more of the mothers of the fourteen-year-olds had met the teacher of their children (forty-three percent) than had the mothers of the ten-year-olds (thirteen percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant differences.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

When the mother wanted the child to do something, fifty-two percent gave a rational explanation ("explain it to him," "give him a reason," talk it over with him") and forty-six percent simply asked and then told him directly, if asking was not effective.

Regarding what follow-up was needed in order to see that the child carried out the task discussed above, sixty-three percent reminded him, checked to see if it was done, encouraged him to do it, or explained why he must do it. Another twenty-five percent did nothing, some because it didn't do any good and some because it was not necessary, as the child always did it.

If the mother realized that the child was not doing the job the right way, then forty-five percent gave him instructions, demonstrated, corrected, explained, told, while forty percent scolded or reprimanded.

Mild verbal reproof was the most frequent form of discipline (thirty percent), with deprivation of privileges the next most frequently (twenty-four percent) and physical punishment employed by eighteen percent of mothers. Rational discussion of the situation was used by twenty-one percent.

When the father disciplined the child, thirty percent used mild verbal reproof, fifteen percent deprived the child of privileges while eleven percent used physical means. Rational discussion was used by nineteen percent of fathers.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was an overall difference in the type of punishment given by the mothers of ten- and fourteen-year-olds. Ten-year-olds were less frequently given verbal reproof (nine percent versus twenty-one percent) and more frequently deprived of privileges (sixteen versus eight percent) and subject to physical punishment (eight percent versus three percent).

When the father disciplined the child the same difference was found for mild verbal reproof as occurred for the mother (nine percent for ten-year-olds and twenty-one percent for fourteen-year-olds). The same differences were found for other types of discipline, ten-year-olds more often being deprived of privilege (ten percent versus five percent) and physical punishment (ten percent versus one percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

As to the methods of getting their child to do something there were differences by social class. While sixty-five percent of the mothers in the upper-middle sample preferred the rationale approach, only thirty-eight percent of upper-lower mothers followed it. The direct strong request was more common for upper-lower mothers than for upper-middle mothers (sixty percent versus thirty-three percent).

To the question about follow-up to make sure the child did the task, there was a significant class difference among those mothers who did nothing, thirteen percent of the upper-lower and thirty-eight percent of the upper-middle mothers utilizing this behavior.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

III. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

To the question "What do you do to help your child get along with other children?" fifteen percent did nothing in this regard, eighteen percent encouraged it, served things for his friends, took them on outings; twenty-two percent trained the child by a positive approach, encouraged certain personal behaviors ("tell him to be friendly"), fifteen percent trained him in a negative way, discouraging certain behaviors ("don't fight," "don't be so bossy"), and thirty percent gave him unspecified positive and negative training or do "whatever they can."

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were a large number of differences by social class. Many more upper-middle class mothers did nothing (twenty-five percent compared to five percent); significantly more upper-middle (twenty-eight percent) encouraged the social activity as compared to only eight percent in the upper-lower mothers. Significantly more upper-lower mothers (twenty-five percent) took a negative approach to the training as compared with five percent of the upper-middle mothers. Many more upper-lower mothers (forty-five percent), gave unspecified training, positive or negative, or did whatever they could, as opposed to only thirteen percent of the upper-middle parents that showed this type of behavior.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

Sixty-four percent of the mothers answered within a combined subcategory where passive approaches such as "tell him not to worry," "tell him we will take care of it," and religious solace was mixed with responses for active ways of anxiety reduction such as "keep busy" and "go for a walk." Twenty-six percent advised direct action toward the source, gave situational or ambivalent responses ("it depends on the problem," "analyze it"), and six percent did not give any advice.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

To the question to the mothers "Have you taken any courses or training since you left school?" fifty-nine percent said no. There was a class difference to this negative response, since seventy-three percent of the upper-lower said no as compared to forty-five percent of the upper-middle mothers. Of the percent that had taken courses, fourteen percent took intellectual short-term courses. Twelve percent took recreational courses such as flower arranging, or some other hobby, and eleven percent domestic activities such as cooking, sewing, and so forth. Only one percent took service courses such as first aid. When asked why they took the courses, the forty percent that had taken them were distributed in the following way: fourteen percent for personal or family usefulness ("to help the family") or social usefulness ("Red Cross or training for teaching"), twenty percent for personal satisfaction ("something to do to get out of the house," "to meet people"), and six percent for self-improvement. When asked "When?" eight percent replied that they had done so shortly after school, ten percent five to ten years ago, fifteen percent at present or within the last four years, and seven percent had taken these courses over a long period of time.

To the question of whether or not they had completed them, nineteen percent said no, six percent said some of them, and fourteen percent said yes. Finally, to the question "Do you feel you gained from it?"

four percent said no and thirty-six percent said yes. More middle class mothers felt they had gained than upper-lower mothers (forty-eight percent versus nineteen percent).

II. Occupational Aspects

To the very first question, it occurred that eighty-three percent of these mothers were housewives. The remaining seventeen percent were divided so thinly across the many categories of the questions about their jobs that there was, we believe, no differential information to be gained from these questions.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

When the mothers were asked what they think or do when criticized, it was found that nineteen percent responded by a rational analysis ("it all depends") or by rational verbal interaction ("talk it over"). However, most of them (thirty-six percent) got defensive verbally, made excuses, criticized back, argued, scolded or else became angry. The next highest group, however, (thirty-two percent) simply ignored the criticism.

When criticized by the husband, the behavior of the mothers was more varied. Twenty-eight percent responded rationally, thirty percent defensive verbally and becoming angry, ten percent ignored the criticism, nine percent took it well, laughed it off, and other nine percent disliked it, got depressed, took it poorly. Finally, an additional ten percent indicated that it did not happen. Again, there was no difference by social class of the mother regarding this pattern of behavior. On the other hand, if the mothers were criticized by friends, twenty-eight percent ignored it, another twenty-eight responded rationally, twenty-six percent with defensive verbal behavior or becoming angry, and five percent took it well, laughed it off. There was again no difference by social class on this kind of behavior.

Finally, when criticized by their own children, again mothers in Mexico, regardless of social class, responded with the same patterns of behavior. In this case, the percentages were spread out for a greater variability of behavior. The highest percentage was to engage in rational behavior (twenty percent), the second was they became angry nineteen percent of the time, the next was "this kind of behavior does not happen" (seventeen percent), defensive verbal behavior ten percent, disliked the behavior nine percent of the time, and eight percent ignored it.

What kinds of things made Mexican mothers angry? The answer was very definite: their children ("the kids when they don't mind").

This kind of opinion was voiced by sixty-three percent of the mothers, ten percent by pet annoyances, nine percent by the annoying behavior of others, the spouse, work, or related problems. Two percent did not get angry, and seven percent were angered by strong annoyances (" am taken advantage of," "people mistreat me") or by unjust accusations ("I am accused of doing something I didn't do"). Finally, six percent by mistreatment from other people, for example, "someone hurts one of my family."

There were two clear social class differences regarding the things that anger a Mexican mother. The cause of anger for eighty-three percent of the upper-lower mothers was their children, while only forty-three percent of the upper-middle mothers gave this reason. Actually, very few other things annoyed the upper-lower Mexican mother, while the upper-middle mothers were spread as to the sources of anger in many other things. This may indicate a larger differentiation of interest in the Mexican mothers of the upper-middle class. It was in accordance with this that with regard to annoying behavior from others, the spouse, work and related problems, the Mexican upper-middle mothers got angry more often (fifteen percent) than did the upper-lower mothers (three percent of the time).

In response to the question "What do you usually do when you are angry?" forty-three percent of the mothers responded by verbal or physical aggression ("tell them I am mad," "curse," "talk back," "start a fight," "kick the wall," "throw something"). Twenty-one percent controlled the anger, coped actively, tried to calm down, counted to ten, did something about it, et cetera. Fourteen percent showed no action or affect, did not speak ("I do nothing," "forget it," "don't mind"), and ten percent reacted with depressed or anxious affect, cried, got sad, felt terrible, got angry with themselves.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Only two out of a possible thirty-six correlations were significant, one negative and three positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), while Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as the number of organized groups belonged to. Both Engagement and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated positively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

Five out of a possible thirty correlations were significant, one negative and four positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother. When the problem in the Authority area was coping with the father's discipline effectiveness was correlated with Coping Effectiveness, Attitude and Persistence in the Task Achievement (Academic) area. When the problem in the Authority area was coping with the father's criticism, effectiveness was correlated with Coping Effectiveness only in the Task Achievement (Academic) area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

Only one out of the eighteen possible correlations was significant. Attitude toward Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

Three out of the twelve possible correlations were significant here. Attitude, Persistence and Engagement in the Task Achievement (Academic) area were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

Seven out of the twenty-four correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area when the child was angry with the mother, with the father and with friends. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in general in the Aggression area and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father. Finally both Attitude and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Eight out of the thirty correlations were significant, two negative and six positive. Activity Level in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother.

Activity Level, defined by number of hobbies, was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when the problem was one of discipline by the father but positively when the problem was one of criticism by the father. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectivness when the problem was one of discipline by the father and Implementation also was correlated with this variable. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively and Initiation in the same area was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when the problem was dealing with criticism by the father.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

Two correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in dealing with criticism by friends, but Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with the same variable.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Six out of the twenty-four correlations were significant, five negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively both with Coping Effectiveness in dealing with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined by number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, while Activity Level, defined by number of hobbies, was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry both with father and with mother. However, Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

Two correlations out of fifteen were significant. Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children. When the Authority figure was the father Coping Effectiveness with Authority was correlated positively with the ability to cope effectively with criticism from other children.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

Implementation in an Anxiety situation was correlated negatively with both Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father. None of the other eight correlations were significant.

Authority by Aggression - Table 12

Six correlations out of the twenty-four were significant, one negative and five positive. Both Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated positively both with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father and when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

There was one significant correlation out of the twelve possible. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There was one significant correlation out of the eight possible. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Summary

In all, there were two hundred seventy-five correlations in this area. Of these forty-eight were significant, sixteen of them negative and thirty-two of them positive.

Two variables had eight significant correlations with the other variables. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated significantly with Coping Effectiveness, Attitude and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic); with Initiation and Implementation in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area; with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children; with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and negatively with Activity Level in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area.

Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area; with Initiation in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area; with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father; with Coping Effectivness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, and negatively with Activity Level, defined by number of organized groups belonged to, and also by number of hobbies, with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Only one variable had no significant correlations with other variables. This was Coping Effectiveness in the Interpersonal Relations area when the child's feelings were hurt.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

Five out of the eighteen correlations were significant, one negative and four positive. Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area was correlated negatively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement. However, Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), assessed in two separate questions, was correlated positively with the same variable. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) as it related to homework was correlated with Parental Initiation in Contacting School and with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

Three out of the eighteen correlations were significant. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Parental Initiation in Contacting School, while Implementation and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated with amount of satisfaction expressed by parent over child's Task Achievement (Academic) performance.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

Only one out of the twelve correlations was significant. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

Two correlations out of eighteen were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School and negatively with Parent's Conception of Major Function of School. That is, those children whose parents indicated that school was important for more than just Academic or Socioeconomic reasons had more hobbies.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

Three of the eighteen possible correlations were significant, two negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement while Coping Effectiveness with the problem of being disciplined by the mother and by the father were correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

One out of the twelve correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Authority x School - Table 24

Two correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School but Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated positively with the same variable.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

Two out of the nine correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when the child's feelings were hurt was correlated negatively with Parental satisfaction over child's Academic Task Achievement, while Coping Effectiveness, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

Two out of the six correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated with Parental Occupational Aspiration and with parent's reasons for the child having jobs around the house, emphasis on child's personality development scoring high.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

One out of the nine correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

Three out of the six correlations were significant. Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated with both Coping Effectiveness and Implementation in the Anxiety area, while Coping Effectiveness only in the Anxiety area was correlated with Parental Initiation in Contacting School.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

Two out of the eight correlations were significant. Both Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father were correlated with amount of satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There was one significant correlation out of the eight possible. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Aggression x School - Table 33

One out of the twelve correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated with Parents' Conception of the Major Function of School.

Summary

Twenty-nine correlations were significant out of a possible two hundred eight. Seven of them were negative and twenty-two were positive.

Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement had by far the greatest number of correlations with other variables, nine of them positive and two of them negative. It was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) and positively with two assessments of Engagement in the same area; with Initiation and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) with Coping Effectiveness when asked to do something by the mother; with both Coping Effectiveness and Implementation in the Anxiety area; with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with the father and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Seven variables were not correlated with any other variable. All of these were in the Child Behavior area. They were Attitude, Initiation and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic); Activity Level and Initiation in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area; Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

There were three significant correlations out of the twelve possible, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork while both Initiation and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

Persistence was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) while Attitude Toward Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). None of the other ten correlations were significant.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

Two correlations out of the thirty were significant. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with amount of Positive Affect mother-child interaction, while Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with amount of Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

One out of the twelve correlations was significant. Activity Level as defined by number of hobbies was correlated with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

Three correlations were significant, all of them negative. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork, while Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Four out of the thirty correlations were significant. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Positive Affect mother-child Interaction, while Activity Leve, both defined by number of organized groups belonged to and number of hobbies, was correlated with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

There were two significant correlations out of the twenty-five. Coping Effectiveness, when criticized by the mother, was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance given by the parent in an Interpersonal Relations situation, while Coping Effectiveness, when criticized by the father, was correlated with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

One out of the fifteen correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children. was correlated negatively with amount of Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

Two of the ten correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction but Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with the same variable.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

One correlation out of the eight was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There were two significant correlations out of the eight possible, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in the same area.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Twenty-three out of a possible two hundred thirty-five correlations were significant, thirteen negative and ten positive.

Two variables, Parental Guidance in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and Degree of Guidance by Parents in Interpersonal Relations were correlated with four other variables. The first variable mentioned was correlated negatively with Attitude Toward Task Achievement (Academic); negatively with Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

The second variable was correlated with Activity Level, defined by number of organized groups belonged to and by number of hobbies, negatively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother.

Seven variables had no significant correlations with other variables. Six of these were in the Child Behavior area. They were Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother, Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by both father and mother, and Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, both as defined by getting along well with other children and when criticized by other children.

One variable was in the Parent Treatment area. This was Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety area.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

Two correlations out of the twenty-four were significant, both of them negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general was correlated negatively with Child's Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic).

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

One correlation out of the twenty-four was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

Two correlations out of twenty were significant, both of them negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her friends and by her children were correlated negatively with Child's Coping Effectiveness when told to so something by the mother.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

One correlation out of the sixteen was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with Child's Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

One correlation out of the six possible was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Child's Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) as defined by number of organized groups belonged to.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There was one significant correlation out of the five possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by father.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

One out of the four possible correlations was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Summary

Of the one hundred thirty correlations only nine were significant, seven of them negative and two of them positive.

Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated with four other variables. These were Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic), Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

There were nineteen variables that had no significant correlations with other variables. They were all in the Child Behavior area.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There were no significant correlations between the two aspects of Parent Behavior investigated.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There was one significant correlation out of the twelve possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Parent's Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

There was one significant correlation out of the twelve possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Parent's Conception of the Major Function of School, where emphasis on Task Achievement received a higher score.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There was one significant correlation out of the three possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Parent's Conception of the Major Function of School, where Task Achievement received a higher score.

Summary

Only three out of a possible forty correlations were significant. Three of the Parent Behavior variables and five of the Parent Attitude variables had no correlations with other variables.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

Two out of a possible eight correlations were significant, both positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general and when criticized by the husband were correlated with Degree of Guidance given by parent in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

Two correlations out of a possible twenty were significant, one negative, one positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general was correlated with Degree of Guidance given by parents in

Interpersonal Relations, while her Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

One correlation out of the five possible was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only five out of a possible one hundred fifty correlations were significant. One of the Parent Behavior variables and six of the Parent Treatment of Child variables had no significant correlations.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

There was one significant correlation out of the six possible. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

One out of the nine correlations was significant. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There was one significant correlation out of a possible six. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental

Attitude Toward Importance of School.

Summary

Three out of the twenty-one possible correlations were significant. Five of the variables had no correlations with other variables. Two of these were in the Task Achievement (Academic) area, one in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area and two in the School area.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were two significant correlations out of a possible five. Degree of Guidance by Parents in an Anxiety Situation was correlated positively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction and negatively with Degree of Guidance given by Parents in an Interpersonal Relations Situation.

Summary

Two correlations out of a possible thirty-three were significant, one negative and one positive.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

One correlation out of a possible six was significant. Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

Two out of a possible fifteen correlations were significant. Parent's Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction while Parental Initiation in Contacting School was correlated with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

There was one significant correlation out of four. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There was one significant correlation out of the six possible. Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, where Task Achievement functions received a high score, was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were no significant correlations.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Five out of a possible eighty correlations were significant, four of them positive and one of them negative. Nine variables had no significant correlations, four of them in the Parent Attitude area and five in the Parent Treatment of Child area.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

There were no significant differences between mother and father frequencies in this area.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

There were no significant differences between mother and father frequencies.

III. Nonacademic Task Achievement

When asked about the child's nonacademic activities, thirty-nine percent of the fathers were able to name one activity, while only sixteen percent of the mothers fell in this category.

A significant difference in reporting also occurred as to the type of activity with the father. Forty-one percent of fathers indicated that they and their child engaged in non-work, non-conversational activity or else described their behavior in positive affect terms. However, only twenty percent of mothers reported that this type of activity occurred between father and child.

When asked about the child's implementation in doing jobs around the house, twenty-three percent of mothers and five percent of fathers reported that they always had to supervise the child. Sixteen percent of mothers and thirty-seven percent of fathers said they seldom had to do this.

IV. Authority

When they corrected a child for not doing a job the right way, nine percent of mothers and twenty-nine percent of fathers indicated that the child simply accepted the correction but twenty-eight percent of mothers and ten percent of fathers indicated an emotional reaction only with no indication of whether the child accepted the parent's authority or not.

When asked how the child reacted when they criticized him, twenty-nine percent of fathers said the child reacted positively, apologized or discussed it. However, only ten percent of mothers reported that the child reacted in this way when criticized by the father.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

Parents were asked to describe how their child got along with other children. Whereas twenty-eight percent of mothers indicated that their child had very few or no friends, only ten percent of fathers said this.

VII. Anxiety

Concerning the child's behavior when worried, twenty-three percent of mothers and forty-nine percent of fathers reported that the child would talk about the worry to someone. Twenty-four percent of mothers but only five percent of fathers reported that the child would become depressed, lose control or express hostile affect.

VIII. Aggression

There were no significant differences in this area.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

Sixty-one percent of fathers had not met their child's teacher as compared to twenty-eight percent of mothers. Sixty-six percent of mothers had initiated the meeting on a nonformal basis, but only fifteen percent of fathers had done this.

Differences also occurred when parents were asked why they thought school was important. Forty-six percent of fathers as compared to twenty-two percent of mothers stressed personal and social development while sixty-eight percent of mothers indicated that they saw school as a preparation for life. Only thirty-seven percent of fathers mentioned this as a reason.

II. Authority

There were no significant differences.

III. Interpersonal Relations

There were no significant differences.

IV. Anxiety

There were no significant differences.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

This series of questions dealt with courses or training taken since leaving school. Approximately sixty percent of mothers and fathers had not taken any courses. Of those who had taken courses, significantly more mothers had not finished them.

II. Occupational Aspects

In Mexico only thirteen out of seventy-nine mothers worked as compared to all forty-one fathers working.

When asked how they came to be in this kind of work, seven percent of the mothers said they wanted it as compared to thirty-seven percent of fathers, a rather large difference. Thirty-eight percent of mothers gave as their reason family trade or pressure as compared to thirty-four percent of fathers. Fifty-three percent of the mothers gave responses which fell into the combined rare response category as opposed to twenty-nine percent of fathers.

In response to the question of what their job was like, ninety-two percent of mothers gave descriptive responses as compared to eighty percent of fathers. When asked how they felt about their job, sixty-nine percent of mothers gave positive affective responses as compared to sixty-three percent of fathers. Thirty percent of the mothers' responses fell into the combined rare response category as compared to twenty-nine percent of fathers.

When parents were asked what they liked about their job, forty-six percent of mothers mentioned being with people they liked as compared to forty-one percent of fathers mentioning this aspect. Forty-six percent of the mothers' responses fell into the rare response category as compared to forty-four percent of fathers.

When asked what they disliked about their jobs, forty-six percent of mothers and forty-one percent of fathers mentioned specific characteristics of the job. Forty-six percent of the mothers' responses and forty-four percent of the fathers' responses fell in the combined rare response category.

When asked if they would choose the same kind of work if they chose again, thirty percent of mothers and thirty-seven percent of fathers said that they would not choose that kind of work. Sixty-nine percent of mothers and sixty-one percent of fathers said they would choose that kind of work.

When asked what they did when problems arose on the job, forty-six percent of mothers and seventy-six percent of fathers said they would solve the problem by themselves, indicating greater independence on the part of the fathers.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, twenty-three percent of mothers and thirty-four percent of fathers said that achieving good social relationships was the preferred method. Tolerance or trying to understand the others' viewpoint was mentioned by thirty percent of mothers and forty-four percent of the fathers.

When asked what was the best way to get along with the boss or supervisor, fifty-three percent of mothers said that the question was not applicable as they worked alone, while only twenty-nine percent of the fathers responded in this manner. Doing one's work well and properly was mentioned by twenty-three percent of mothers and thirty-four percent of fathers.

III. Personal Characteristics

When parents were asked how they reacted to criticism, there were a number of significant differences. Sixty-three percent of fathers but only nineteen percent of mothers indicated their reaction was one of rational analysis. Thirty-three percent of mothers and fifteen percent of fathers would ignore the criticism, while thirty-seven percent of mothers as compared to ten percent of fathers would get angry.

When the person criticizing was a friend, twenty-eight percent of mothers and fifty-nine percent of fathers would react rationally, twenty-eight percent of mothers and twelve percent of fathers would ignore the criticism and while twenty-seven percent of mothers would get angry, only five percent of fathers indicated they would do this.

Sixteen percent of mothers and forty-one percent of fathers reported that they were never criticized by their own children.

Sixty-three percent of mothers were made angry because of the behavior of their children, but this angered only fifteen percent of fathers. However, while thirty-two percent of fathers were made angry by the annoying behavior of others or work-related problems, only nine percent of mothers fell in this category.

When they were angry, twenty percent of mothers tried to control their anger or cope actively. Significantly more fathers (forty-one percent) reported that they followed this behavior.

ENGLAND

INTRODUCTION

To select the sample of parents to be interviewed the children in each of the eight sub-groups were divided at the median of the Achievement scores (Reading and Mathematics). Children where both parents were not present were eliminated and the sample was then randomly selected, five from each side of the median. Refusals necessitated random replacement from the appropriate half cell, giving a total of eighty mothers.

The head teachers of the schools concerned were most cooperative in giving lists of addresses of the parents who had been sampled. Initially all mothers were contacted by the research associate who visited each address, explained the purpose of the interview and made an appointment for an interviewer to call. An appointment card was left with the mother so she would have a reminder of when the interviewer was coming. If the appointment was made more than two weeks ahead a reminder card was sent through the mail a few days before the actual interview.

At the time of the initial contact the possibility of interviewing the father also was mentioned to the mother but it was made clear that each interview would be carried out separately. In between making the appointment and the actual interview the mother was asked to approach her husband. When the interviewer called, he ascertained whether or not the father was willing to be interviewed and if so made a firm appointment.

The areas in which the families were living were generally representative of the schools in which the testing had been carried out. There were three main areas--predominantly upper middle class, mixed mixed lower middle and upper working and working class.

Two mothers refused to be interviewed, both from the upper middle class grouping, one the mother of a ten-year-old girl, the other of a fourteen-year-old girl. Both refused because they could not see that the study had any direct relevance to their own child and were therefore not interested. Forty-eight fathers agreed to be interviewed, thus leaving thirty-two who were not willing, thirteen from the middle class and nineteen from the working class groups. The main reason given was lack of time. Some fathers did indicate that if an insufficient number of father interviews were obtained they would find the time to be interviewed. It was not necessary to call on them, however, as more than forty father interviews were obtained.

Parents who were interviewed gave readily of their time and were most hospitable on the whole. It was rare for an interviewer to experience the extremes of being offered a steak for lunch at one interview

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

Almost three-quarters of the children in the sample (seventy-four percent) lived with both their parents. Only two, both fourteen-year-old working class children (one boy, one girl) lived with only one parent. Fourteen percent lived with one parent and a relative, while ten percent lived with a parent and a non-relative.

Neither the age nor the social class of the child made any significant difference as to who took the main responsibility for him, both parents or just the mother or the father. However, the sex of the child did make a difference. Responsibility was assumed by both parents for fifty-five percent of the boys in the sample, but only for twenty-five percent of the girls. Mothers alone were responsible for seventy-five percent of the girls, a significantly higher percentage than that for the number of mothers mainly responsible for boys (thirty-eight percent).

Sixty-three percent of the mothers interviewed were born in the London area, the number being fairly evenly distributed on the three variables of age, class and sex. No further significant differences occurred in any other of the birthplace groupings.

A smaller percentage of fathers (fifty percent) were born in London and, as for the mothers, the numbers were fairly evenly distributed on the three variables. Twenty percent of fathers were born in a different country but one with a close cultural similarity to England, Scotland being a good example. In this category there was a significant socioeconomic status difference, with thirty percent in the working class and ten percent in the middle class categories.

Neither class nor sex revealed significant differences in the distribution of the age of mothers, but as might be expected the age of the child proved a significant variable. Of the mothers interviewed thirty-eight percent of those with fourteen-year-old children fell in the age range forty-five to forty-nine years of age, while significantly fewer mothers of ten-year-olds (ten percent) were in this category. Fifty percent of mothers of fourteen-year-olds were younger than forty-five, while sixty-five percent of mothers of ten-year-olds were younger.

As far as age of fathers was concerned ten-year-olds had slightly (but not significantly) younger fathers.

Just under half of the mothers in the sample did not have a paid occupation. Among those who did work, significantly more were mothers of fourteen-year-old than of ten-year-old children and significantly more were mothers of working class children.

The significant class results on the question concerning father's occupation were exactly as had been expected since careful grading of occupation had been built into the sample selection.

While thirty-eight percent of the fathers of children sampled had educational qualifications of 'A' level (Matriculation) or above, only twenty percent of the mothers had studied to this level with significantly more upper lower mothers leaving school at age fifteen.

The level of the father's education produced some highly significant class differences, forty percent of the upper middle and none of the upper lower fathers being university graduates, while eighty-three percent of the upper lower and thirteen percent of the upper middle fathers had left school at fifteen.

Almost half of the sample (forty-nine percent) had lived in their present house for eleven years or more, while a further thirty-three percent had lived there at least five years. Thus, the sample might be regarded as a fairly stable one in terms of geographical mobility. This was especially so in light of the fact that eighty-six percent had only lived in one or no other place since the child tested had been born.

Thirty-six percent of the children sampled had never been in a hospital and the remainder had only been in for short periods of time. So while it had been originally hypothesized that time in a hospital might have a great effect on the child's development this did not seem to be so in the case of the sample drawn.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

This series of questions in the interview was aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his manner of tackling academic problems as perceived by the mother.

Fifty-nine percent of mothers reported that their children had a positive attitude toward school. Only fourteen percent reported that their children had negative or strong negative feelings. In terms of achievement, thirty-three percent saw their child as achieving above average in relation to his age group, while twenty-eight percent indicated that their child was below average or unsatisfactory. The greatest number of parents (forty percent) reported their child's achievement as basically average.

Only nineteen percent of the mothers interviewed reported that their children tried to avoid doing their homework. The remainder did it either at a regular time or immediately on coming home from school.

Twenty-six percent of the children had to be reminded to do their homework, but the remainder got down to it without any pushing from their parents.

Only three percent always put off their homework to do other things. The great majority seldom or never did this. If they made a mistake in the homework over half the children would start over again, while twenty-one percent would not.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more mothers of fourteen-year-olds felt that their child was doing poorly in school (twenty-eight percent) as compared to eight percent of mothers of ten-year-olds.

Although about the same number of ten- and fourteen-year-olds put off their homework until the last minute or did not do it at all (eighteen to twenty percent), significantly more ten- than fourteen-year-olds gave it top priority.

The reverse was true when initiative was considered. More fourteen-year-olds (sixty-eight percent) began their homework totally on their own initiative. Forty percent of ten-year-olds followed this pattern.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Their were no significant class differences in this area.

3. Sex

With regard to homework, girls seemed more conscientious than boys. Thirty-five percent of the girls in the sample gave homework a high priority, doing it immediately upon coming home from school. Only thirteen percent of the boys followed this pattern. Twenty-five percent of the boys sometimes put off their homework to do other things but a significantly fewer number of girls (five percent) did this.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The distribution of responses to the question concerning the child's academic performance would suggest that the parents were giving a fairly realistic report on their children, with the majority seeing their child's performance as basically average and fairly equal numbers giving positive and negative reports. Without this balanced distribution it would, perhaps, be a little difficult to accept the report on homework patterns which, on the whole, showed the children in a very favorable light. The picture was one of over three-quarters of the children sampled doing their homework at a regular time with little or no reminding from their parents. Ten-year-olds needed to be reminded more than fourteen-year-olds and it seemed that girls were more earnest than boys about getting it done as soon as possible. Less than twenty percent even sometimes put off their homework to do other things.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

The questions in this area were aimed at obtaining an assessment of parent's aspirations and expectations for the child.

There was some discrepancy between the parent's educational aspiration for the child and his expectation of the same child's actual performance. Thus while thirty-six percent of mothers would like their child to continue with college or university education only twenty-four percent expected that he would do this. And thirty-three percent expected their child to leave school at fifteen as compared to only twenty-one percent of parents who would actually like their child to leave at that age. Just under twenty percent would leave the matter to the child's preference, letting him do what he preferred to do.

This discrepancy between aspiration and expectation did not occur to anywhere the same extent in the occupational area. While no parents either aspired to or expected their children to have jobs in the two lowest working class categories, sixteen percent aspired to and thirteen percent expected jobs in the upper middle class categories.

What was interesting about the responses to these two questions was the high percentage of parents who either replied by answering "Don't know" or by placing the onus on the child indicating that the occupation they would like their child to take up was what he wanted or what would make him happy. Forty-one percent of replies to the aspiration question came in this area and fifty-eight percent for expectation.

On the negative side the only type of job that parents reported with a high frequency that they would not like their child to have was one with a low status (forty-four percent).

When parents were asked what type of work they thought their child would like to take up, thirty-one percent gave a "Don't know" response. Thirty-five percent, however, indicated that their child would like a job in the upper middle class categories.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences on the educational questions.

In the occupational area significantly more parents of ten-year-olds (seventy percent as compared to forty-five percent) said they did not know what type of work their child would probably do when he grew up.

Significantly more parents of fourteen-year-olds thought that their child would like a lower middle class job (twenty-three percent as compared to three percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

In the educational area significantly more middle class parents would like their child to go to university, while significantly more working class mothers expected their child to leave school at age fifteen.

This pattern continued in the occupational area with significantly more working class parents (twenty-five percent) wanting their child to have a lower middle class occupation as compared to three percent of the middle class. Significantly more middle class parents thought that their children would prefer an upper middle class occupation.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in the educational area. In the occupational area significantly more mothers of females would like their child to have a lower middle class job (twenty-three percent as compared to five percent).

c. Summary and Interpertation

Whether it was aspiration or expectation that was being considered it would seem that a number of parents would be disappointed by the child's eventual academic attainment. An expectation of college or university education by twenty-four percent compares badly with an actual admission rate over the whole country of approximately seven percent. The gap is even greater between an aspiration of college or university education by thirty-six percent of the mothers interviewed. There were no significant age differences here so the high percentage cannot be attributed mainly to parents of ten-year-olds who had not yet fully realized the limits of their child's ability.

At the other end of the scale parents seemed to have a more realistic approach in that, while only twenty-one percent actually wanted their children to leave school at age fifteen, thirty-three percent expected them to, with significantly more working class mothers falling in this category. It would seem that it was the children themselves rather than the parents who needed encouragement to remain at school for longer than was required.

When the figures were broken down by class the trend was the familiar one of more middle class mothers aspiring to a university education for their children.

One figure that might cause concern is the percentage of mothers (twenty percent) who would leave the matter of the level of educational attainment up to the child. This would suggest, perhaps, a lack of interest or an amount of permissiveness not necessarily in the child's best interest. This could be a way of shelving responsibility for decision. As parental interest has been shown to be one of the main factors in achievement, such a response would seem to indicate a lack of interest that could prove a handicap to the child.

This type of response was more common to the occupational questions and could be a cause for real concern. Over half the responses to the question concerning the occupation that parents expected their child to take up fell in the "Don't know" category. Even taking into account the fact that a significantly greater number of these came from parents of ten-year-olds who might legitimately be expected to be a little vague about their child's future, the figure was still too large.

If we accept the argument put forward by Daws that "occupational choice is the outcome of a developmental process that has extended over many years," it would seem essential for parents to have a positive approach even at age ten, at least in terms of the ultimate level if not in terms of a specific job.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

Eighty percent of the mothers were able to list at least one activity in which their child engaged and indeed fifty-four percent indicated that their child had four or more activities in which he was interested.

When the question was the more specific one of joint activities of child and parent all mothers were able to give some response, and by far the highest percentage (forty-six percent) indicated nonverbal, non-work activity. However, nineteen percent indicated that the only type of interaction was of a negative nature, for example, they fought or did not like each other very much.

Activities with the father followed a similar pattern, the highest percentage (forty-one percent) being again for a nonverbal, non-work activity. Slightly more children (twenty-four percent) were reported as having a negative relationship with their fathers than with their mothers.

When it came to activities with the family, holidays were mentioned most frequently (thirty-eight percent), followed by outings of various types (twenty-eight percent). Only one mother indicated that her child did nothing with the family. Eight percent indicated that the family went to church together and only eighteen percent mentioned that they watched television together.

Quite a large number of children (thirty-eight percent) did not belong to any clubs or groups. Forty-three percent were members of an organized group such as the scouts or a church youth group, while six percent belonged to sports clubs.

However, this did not mean that children were not interested in nonacademic activities of a non-organized nature. Parents indicated that twenty-six percent of the children regarded sports as a hobby, while twenty percent were interested in music or art. However, there were still twenty-three percent whose parents indicated the child had no hobby.

A fifth of the sample interviewed did not have any set jobs or chores around the house; as many boys as girls fell in this category. The most common job mentioned was that of dishwashing (twenty percent), followed by bedmaking (fourteen percent). More boys than girls washed the family car (eighteen percent compared to three percent) and, as might be expected, more girls (twenty percent) than boys (eight percent) helped clean the house.

As far as reasons for having a job around the house were concerned, the most common one was that of helping the parents (twenty-nine percent), with the aim of teaching responsibility coming next (fifteen percent).

Over half of the children never or seldom had to be reminded to do their chores but thirteen percent always had to be reminded. Most children did their chores without asking for assistance from anyone else, though twenty-one percent did sometimes try to get their siblings to do their jobs for them. Most parents thought these jobs were carried out pretty well. Only nine percent indicated that their child performed poorly.

Finally, forty-eight percent of children seldom or never did anything around the house without being asked, more boys than girls falling in this category.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in the number or type of activities the child pursued with either father or mother. It did prove to be a significant variable in family activities, however, with more parents of fourteen-year-olds reporting holidays as a family activity, while significantly more parents of ten-year-olds mentioned family outings.

While equal numbers of ten- and fourteen-year-olds belonged to clubs such as scouts or church youth groups, significantly more parents of ten-year-olds reported that their child belonged to artistic or intellectual type clubs or groups.

Children who did jobs around the house were not significantly different in their distribution by age, though more ten- than fourteen-year-olds did have jobs but the reasons for them having the jobs did differ. Significantly more parents of fourteen-year-olds (forty percent) gave as a reason "helping parents" while significantly more parents of ten-year-olds (twenty-eight percent as against three percent for fourteen-year-olds) indicated that they gave the child a job in order to teach him responsibility.

That this aim was not always fulfilled became clear with responses to the following question where twenty-five percent of parents of ten-year-old children indicated that they always had to remind the child to do his chores. No parents of fourteen-year-olds reported having to do this. As might be expected, a significant difference also occurred at the other end of the scale, with thirty-three percent of parents of fourteen-year-olds never having to remind their children as compared to ten percent of parents of ten-year-olds.

However, when they did perform their tasks both age groups seemed to carry them out efficiently without asking for assistance from anyone.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The question concerning activities with the mother produced two significant class differences. Significantly more upper class children (sixty percent compared to thirty-three percent) took part with their mother in nonverbal, non-work activities such as playing cards, going to the cinema and so on, while significantly more working class children (forty percent compared to thirteen percent) worked with their mother on some constructive activity such as washing up or cleaning the house.

Class seemed to play no part in whether the child had a negative relationship with the mother, there being an almost equal number in each category. This negative aspect was maintained in the relationship with the father, where more working than middle class mothers reported it happening, but not to a significant degree.

There was a significant difference between the working and middle class with respect to the number of children who did work around the house with their father (twenty-eight percent of the working as compared to five percent of the middle class).

There were no significant class differences to the questions concerning either activities with the family or membership in clubs or groups. However, a significantly greater number of working class children (thirty-five percent) did not have any reported hobby.

Equal numbers in both classes had jobs around the house with significantly more middle class children (twenty-three percent) making their own beds.

When evaluating their performance in this area, significantly more working class parents were prepared to give a good rating. Significantly more middle class parents indicated that performance was only satisfactory.

Significantly more upper lower children seldom had to be supervised in their household tasks.

3. Sex

Significantly more mothers of boys (thirty percent) reported a negative relationship or lack of interaction with their child as compared with eight percent of the mothers of girls.

For those who did interact with their mothers there was, as might be expected, a significant sex difference in the frequency of constructive activity such as cleaning the house or washing up. Forty percent of mothers of girls reported this as compared to thirteen percent of mothers of boys.

The lack of relationship also occurred with the father but in this case the posititions were reversed, more girls (thirty-three percent) than boys (fifteen percent) falling in this category.

The sex of the child seemed to make little difference as to the type of activities pursued with the family or to participation in clubs or groups. There was, however, a significant difference on the hobbies question, with more girls (thirty-three percent) than boys (eight percent) studying music or art.

Rather surprisingly there were no significant differences on any of the questions that related to jobs around the house. It seemed that boys and girls did more or less the same sort of chores and performed them with equal efficiency, for much the same reasons.

c. Summary and Interpretation

On the whole, the picture presented by the responses to this series of questions was one of a fairly stable family relationship with children participating in family activities and also interacting with both parents with little or no change in frequency from age ten to age fourteen. If there is to be a break with family activities it would seem that it occurs after this age.

A minority of children did not get along with their parents and it was interesting to see that the majority of those who did not get along with their mothers were boys, while the majority of those who did not get along with their fathers were girls.

A surprisingly low percentage mentioned television viewing as a family activity. It may be that this particular activity has become so much a part of the pattern of day to day living that it is no longer seen as having any significance as a family activity. It has in fact taken on the same status as that of such an activity as eating together which is such an integral part of family life that it is not really perceived as an activity at all.

One disturbing feature was the lack of any outside interest or hobby by almost a quarter of the sample, with significantly more working class children falling in this category. If, as has been suggested by Jensen, the school will have to assume, for culturally disadvantaged children, more responsibility for child rearing, this would seem to be one of the areas where a start could be made by providing the child with an interest and activity outside of school hours.

One interesting point to come out of the questions concerning jobs around the house was the amount of sexual equality. For this sample at least, more or less equal numbers of boys and girls did the same jobs around the house with the exceptions of washing the car and house cleaning where traditional roles appear to have been maintained although the differences were not statistically significant.

The reason for having jobs seemed to change with age, parents starting out at ten with the idea of inculcating a sense of responsibility. At age fourteen this seemed to have been replaced by the aim of helping parents.

While children carried out their chores with a fair degree of efficiency it would seem that the idea of helping parents had not been as thoroughly assimilated as it might have been in that fifty-eight percent never helped around the house spontaneously, males asserting their independence rather more than females.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

Twenty-five percent of the mothers found it difficult to give a firm response about their child's reaction to their authority. They indicated that it would all depend on the situation, or the mood the child was in at the time. However, thirty-one percent indicated that their child would act positively if corrected, and a further nine percent that the child would react neutrally in such a situation by obeying without any indication of either negative or positive feeling. The percentage of negative reactions was much smaller than the positive ones (eighteen percent). This included refusal by the child to do as he was told.

Mothers indicated that there were various reactions by the child in a disciplinary situation. This was what might be expected. What seemed of interest here was the number of mothers who indicated that they never disciplined or punished their children (twenty-five percent). The number of fathers who never disciplined or punished was even higher (thirty-six percent). Of the children who were disciplined and gave some reaction in this situation, twenty-eight percent reacted positively while nineteen percent either sulked or withdrew to their room, when their mother was the authority figure. Fifteen percent cried and ten percent expressed hostility, either of a verbal or a nonverbal nature.

Almost the same percentage (twenty-five percent) reacted positively when the authority figure was the father, but only eight percent sulked or withdrew, while nineteen percent cried and five percent were hostile.

No mother reported not criticizing her child, but they did indicate that eleven percent of the fathers did not critize at all.

The most common response to mother's criticism was for the child to argue or talk back (twenty-five percent) but with the father the most common response was for the child to become hurt and, in some cases, to cry (twenty-five percent for the combined response). Almost equal percentages gave a positive response to criticism (twenty percent for the mother, nineteen percent for the father). Although it was not the most common response to the father's criticism, sixteen percent of the children did argue or talk back, while twenty percent became hurt or cried when criticized by their mother.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more ten- than fourteen-year-olds were reported as acting positively when corrected by their mothers (forty-three percent as compared to twenty percent).

As might be expected, significantly more ten- than fourteen-year-olds reacted to discipline by their mother by crying. Only one fourteen-year-old was reported as doing this. Age played no significant part in how children reacted to discipline by their father, and there were no significant age differences in how children reacted to criticism from either parent.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences on the authority questions.

3. Sex

The only significant sex difference was for the numbers of children not disciplined by the father (twenty-three percent of boys and fifty percent of girls).

c. Summary and Interpertation

One of the questions which might perhaps have been asked in this section was the reason why either or both parents did not discipline their child. Thirty-six percent of fathers came in this category. Twenty were the fathers of girls and nine the fathers of boys (a significant difference).

The father's traditional role has been one of discipline but, in this sample at least, it seems to be a role that is increasingly being abandoned. There was no significant class difference, middle and working class fathers alike not utilizing their authority. Perhaps more disturbing was the fact that a quarter of the mothers interviewed never disciplined their children either. Inevitably this leaves one wondering if there are some households where there is no authority figure at all.

In the case of criticism, however, the figures are much lower. All mothers criticized their children at some time, while only eleven percent of fathers did not criticize at all. Perhaps because of the familiarity of the mother figure the most common reaction to her criticism was for the child to argue or talk back.

With the father, however, children most commonly felt hurt. However, these were not exclusive responses. Children did argue with their father or feel hurt when their mother criticized them.

V. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

In the area of Interpersonal Relations, criticism by friends or siblings produced very marked reactions, eighty-one percent of the children either arguing, being hurt or (much more frequently) shouting, quarreling or even fighting physically. Only five percent reacted positively.

In spite of this type of reaction, only nine percent of parents indicated that their child got along poorly with other children. Over half of the sample thought their children got along very well, or excellently, with others.

When asked about peer influence forty-three percent of mothers indicated that they did not think their children's friends influenced them in any way. Of those who did see an influence, almost equal numbers (nine percent) saw it as good or bad while thirty-four percent indicated some specific influence, such as "hair styles," "what they play," and so on.

That these children were sensitive to their friends' actions was clear from the responses given in the situation where their feelings had been hurt. Sixty-nine percent either showed depressive negative affect or withdrew from the situation. Unlike the criticism situation only eleven percent of the children expressed their reaction in a hostile aggressive way.

Only one mother reported that her child was able to cope with the situation by reacting in a positive manner toward the other person, while nine percent reported a stoical attitude on the part of their child.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The replies to the questions asked in this section seemed to indicate that aggressive behavior was a normal response in interpersonal relationships. Over fifty percent of parents thought their children got along well or even excellently with others but also indicated that their child reacted aggressively when criticized by his peers.

While it might have been expected that parents of fourteen-year-olds would have noted more peer influence on their children's behavior there was, in fact, no significant age difference.

VI. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

Twenty-six percent of the sample reacted to worry either by withdrawing to their room or by some other physical or physiological behavior which did not solve the problem, such as biting their nails. Twenty-five percent talked their problem over with someone else but a further nineteen percent became very depressed. Only four percent tried to cope with the worry by goal-directed thinking.

Nine percent of mothers did not know what their child did when he was worried and a further five percent indicated that, as far as they knew, their children did not worry at all.

Of those who did worry, academic problems were the greatest cause for concern for forty-four percent, their own faults and behavior the next highest (eighteen percent) with an almost equal number concerned with adolescent problems such as their appearance (sixteen percent). Five percent worried about family problems.

When their children were worried, twenty-four percent of parents reported that they did not turn to others for help. Of those who did, thirty-six percent turned to both parents or their father alone, while twenty-eight percent turned to their mother alone, the remainder turning to siblings or someone outside the family.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The only significant class difference was related to the number of working class children who turned to their mother only for help when worried (forty percent as compared with eighteen percent of middle class children).

3. Sex

With regard to type of worry, significantly more girls (twenty-eight percent) worried about adolescent problems (five percent of boys), while significantly more boys worried about their own behavior (twenty-eight percent as compared to eight percent of girls).

c. Summary and Interpretation

This seems to be an area of particular difficulty for children regardless of age, sex or social class. A very small percentage tried to cope actively with the worry. More turned to other people, including their parents, for help and it seems that this is an area in which parents could actively help their children by indicating efficient ways of coping with worry. This of course assumes that parents are already familiar with effective coping techniques, which is not always the case.

In some cases, in fact, it would seem that parents can help only by showing ways of dealing with the worry rather than with the problem that is causing it. For instance, forty-four percent of the children were worried about academic problems. It might be difficult for parents to tackle the actual subject matter involved but they might be able to indicate ways in which the child could solve his particular difficulty, for instance by reference to books, asking the teacher or some other means.

VII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

By far the greatest number of children (sixty-one percent) were made angry by petty everyday annoyances inflicted upon them by others --someone picking on them, calling them names and so on. The cause next most frequently mentioned was parents and authority figures in general (fifteen percent) followed by mistreatment of other people by someone (thirteen percent). Only two mothers reported that their children never got angry.

Overwhelmingly the response to the situation provoking the anger was one of hostility. Thirty-eight percent expressed verbal hostility and a further twenty-four percent were physically aggressive. Only four percent tried to cope actively with the anger. Ten percent withdrew and nine percent expressed hostile affect only.

While fourteen percent did not usually get angry with their mother, thirty percent did not get angry with their father. Behavior also differed according to which parent the child was angry with. If it was the mother, hostility was the primary response. Thirty percent were verbally aggressive, while sixteen percent were openly rebellious, throwing a temper tantrum and so on. Of the remaining children, twenty-five percent withdrew from the situation, going to their own room. Only six percent tried to control their anger or resolve the misunderstanding.

With the father, however, only nineteen percent were verbally hostile while fourteen percent rebelled. Twenty-six percent of the children withdrew from the situation. Only two children tried to cope with the situation.

When the situation was reversed and a friend was angry with the child, many parents admitted that they did not know what their child did (thirty percent). Of those who did have some knowledge of behavior, twenty-three percent mentioned hostile behavior, either verbal or physical, while twenty-one percent indicated withdrawal and/or finding other friends to play with. Only five percent tried to resolve the difficulty by finding out why their friend was angry. Nine percent simply became depressed and nine percent did nothing.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Only one significant age difference occurred in this area. More fourteen- than ten-year-olds withdrew to their room when angry with their mother (thirty-five compared to eight percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

When angry with their mother, significantly more working class children (twenty-three percent) than middle class children (five percent) withdrew their affection.

Significantly more working class children were never angry with their father (forty-five percent compared to thirteen percent for middle class children). Of those who did get angry with their father thirty-eight percent of middle class children withdrew to their room while only eight percent of working class children did this.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

As with anxiety, this seemed to be an area in which parents should be able to show their children a more effective coping response than the ones they were using. This was particularly so in the case of the mother where forty-six percent of the children reacted aggressively in some manner. It would be interesting to discover why more children never got angry with their father; because he is a very powerful authority figure or, perhaps, because he is seldom in the home.

More evidence would seem necessary on the value and effectiveness of the aggressive response. Does it, in fact, solve the problem and therefore become, for the child at least, good coping?

Just how much this type of response is merely a copying of parental behavior seems to be of importance here. As will be seen when the parent's responses to anger are discussed, a large number of these were also aggressive, either verbally or physically hostile.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

On the whole parents were satisfied with their children's performance in school.

While only five percent of parents had never met their child's teacher, for seventy-nine percent it was only on a formal routine occasion such as on an Open Evening.

Most parents tried to encourage their child in his schoolwork in some way. Twenty-six percent helped with homework only, while twenty-one percent went further and either provided encyclopedias for their children or took them on museum visits and other trips of academic value. A further thirty-four percent discussed their children's schoolwork with them, encouraging them or talking about its importance for the future.

However, when it came to helping with homework forty-six percent of parents did nothing either because they considered their help was not necessary or because the child received a detention at school if he did not do his homework. Only ten percent gave active help or used rewards or punishment as a means of assistance. By far the most common behavior was a verbal reminder ranging from just asking the child to frequent scolding and reminding (thirty-five percent).

Most parents felt that school was very important, mainly for the social development of the child and for socioeconomic reasons. However a quarter of the mothers saw it as important for the personal development of the child.

But, when directly asked what the school's job or responsibility was, sixty-one percent of the mothers indicated that its primary purpose was education.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more mothers of ten- than fourteen-year-olds had met their child's teacher on routine formal occasions.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

It would seem that the mothers interviewed were almost uniformly interested in the child's progress at school. This attitude was apparent in both class divisions and for both sex and age groupings. If, as many studies have indicated, parental interest and encouragement play a large part in the child's achievement, this is a most heartening sign.

Not so encouraging, perhaps, is the high percentage (forty-six percent) who did nothing regarding homework, although consideration of the homework patterns reported partially helps to explain this in that a large number of children seemed to settle down to it on their own initiative.

Only ten percent gave active help, a figure that must be considered in the light of the new teaching methods that are being used (particularly the introduction of the new mathematics) which leaves many parents bewildered. Perhaps what is needed are more classes to acquaint parents with what their children are really learning at school.

There is little evidence of the close parent-teacher relationship so greatly emphasized by the Plowden report (1967). Admittedly ninety-five percent of the mothers had met the child's teacher but for over three-quarters of them it was a routine occasion with five or perhaps ten minutes to discuss problems.

This is, of course, not always the fault of the parent. As Choen has shown, the idea of a more diffuse role for the teacher with closer contact between home and school has received little support from head teachers, while in Goodacre's study it was found that contacts with parents seldom extended beyond meetings on school premises. Few schools had established parent-teacher organizations and few teachers ever visited pupils' homes. It would seem then that the sample interviewed in this study was not untypical of the country in this respect.

While some investigators have reported class differences among parents regarding their view of the responsibility of the school, no significant differences occurred in the present investigation. Well over half the sample still believed the school's job was to educate the child, though unfortunately definitions of "educate" were not obtained. That the conception of "educate" may vary widely was suggested by answers to another question asking why parents felt school was important. A quarter of the parents indicated school was important for the personal development of the child and a majority mentioned social development and socioeconomic reasons. These replies would seem to indicate that "educate" means much more than straight academic achievement.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

When they want their child to do something, over three-quarters of the parents (seventy-eight percent) initially made the request in a mild polite way and forty-eight percent found that nothing was required beyond this, the children then doing as requested. For those for whom some follow-up was necessary, equal numbers (twenty percent) needed either to be reminded or to be continually scolded to get the task done.

If they found their child was doing a job incorrectly most parents (eighty-three percent) indicated that they would demonstrate or explain the correct way and then leave their child to do it himself. A minority would either scold the child (five percent) or make him work it out for himself.

When asked how they disciplined or punished their children, mothers gave a wide variety of responses. Twenty-one percent indicated they made use of deprivation of privilege, while thirteen percent used deprivation of movement, confining the child to his room or to the house. Thirteen percent used mild verbal reproof while nineteen percent used strong verbal behavior or threats. Only four percent tried discussion or praise as a means of discipline. Twenty-four percent indicated they never punished their child at all.

The number of fathers who did not punish their child was even larger (thirty-one percent). Of those who did discipline their children, sixteen percent used mild verbal and eighteen percent strong verbal reproof. Thirteen percent used deprivation of privilege while nine percent made use of deprivation of movement. Only five percent tried discussion or praise as a means of discipline.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was a significant age difference as to the number of mothers who used deprivation of movement as a means of discipline, with more mothers of ten-year-olds employing this method.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significant class differences occurred as to the type of follow-up used by parents after initially requesting their child to carry out a task. Significantly more (thirty percent) middle class parents scolded their children as compared with ten percent of working class parents.

There was also a significant class difference as to the number of children who needed a reminder. While sixty-eight percent of working class parents indicated that their children needed no reminder, only twenty-eight percent of middle class parents reported this.

3. Sex

Significantly more fathers of females never disciplined or punished their child.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Just as the answers to the questions on homework, replies to these questions presented almost too good a picture. The calm parent politely requests and the child politely conforms.

III. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

In this area parents could be divided into two categories. Whether they did nothing to help their children get along with their peers (thirty-six percent) or they encouraged social activity by having the friends to the house or taking them on outings.

b. Significant Differences

There were no significant age, class or sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

There seems little to say about this question except to suggest that the thirty-six percent of parents who did nothing to help the child might have made more effort. Parental encouragement is surely important in all aspects of coping behavior and this may be an area that a child finds particularly difficult.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

When their child was worried the majority of mothers (fifty-three percent) tried to bring about tension reduction either by giving the child support or reassurance or by suggesting some way in which he might forget the worry, for example by keeping busy.

Only eleven percent counseled direct action toward the source, with almost as many (eight percent) telling the child to accept the inevitability of the situation.

b. Significant Differences

There were no significant age, class or sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

This has already been discussed in the child's section on Anxiety.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

Over half the mothers interviewed (fifty-eight percent) had not taken any courses or training since they left school.

Twenty-three percent of mothers had taken courses because it was necessary for their occupation, a nurse's training for instance. Only four percent had taken courses with the idea of self-improvement in mind. Nine percent had taken them for the sake of interest or as a distraction (to get out of the house). Six percent had taken them with the idea of helping the family.

Most women had taken the courses almost immediately upon leaving school and in most cases had completed them and felt they had gained from them.

c. Summary and Interpretation

A summary is not necessary as the few results are self-explanatory.

II. Occupational Aspects

a. Description of Frequencies

Of the mothers interviewed, just over half had a job of some kind (fifty-four percent). Of those who did work, seventy-four percent felt positively about the job while the remainder were neutral. No one expressed negative feelings. This absence of negative feeling also appeared when the mothers were asked what they disliked about their job, with fifty-four percent indicating that there was nothing they disliked. Seven percent found their job boring while fourteen percent disliked the poor conditions. The remainder (twenty-three percent) indicated that it was a special characteristic of the job that made them dislike it.

A special characteristic was also the reason given by a number of mothers for liking a particular job (fifty-four percent). In spite of this, fifty-eight percent of those working would not choose the same sort of work if they had to make the decision again.

When faced with problems in the job situation, two types of coping seemed equally popular, either to solve the problem completely alone (thirty-three percent) or to seek help either from a co-worker or a supervisor.

There also seemed to be two main ways of getting along with fellow workers. The first, favored by forty-seven percent, was to achieve a good social relationship by being friendly. The second approach, used by thirty-five percent of the working mothers, was one of tolerance, trying to understand the other person's point of view.

Sixty-four percent of mothers indicated that the best way to get along with the boss was to do the work well and to do as they were told. A smaller percentage (twenty-five percent) thought that the key to good relations was to show respect for the boss.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was a significant class difference in the number of mothers who did not work, there being more middle than working class mothers in this category.

Among those who did work significantly more working class mothers would not choose the same job if they had to make the decision again.

c. Summary and Interpretation

On the whole, the attitude toward work among mothers seemed positive and seemed to indicate that they would encourage their children in a like attitude. However, while they indicated what appropriate coping behavior was in various situations there was, of course, no evidence that they always carried it out.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

When mothers were asked how they reacted to criticism, responses varied according to the people who criticized them. To criticism in the abstract thirty-eight percent indicated they would analyze it in a rational way. However, when the person criticizing was the husband this figure dropped to twenty-five percent, the same percentage for friends, and eleven percent if the person criticizing was her own child. Other types of responses varied accordingly.

Twenty-four percent thought they would dislike criticism and take it poorly but when specific people were mentioned the percentage was smaller, fifteen percent for husbands, sixteen percent for friends and fifteen percent for children.

Fifteen percent thought they would get mad or argue if criticized but only in a specific situation. Twenty-one percent would argue with their husband, but only eight percent would get angry with their friend. Fifteen percent would get angry with their children.

The response given least frequently was that of ignoring the criticism altogether. Eleven percent indicated they would ignore criticism from their children but only four percent would ignore it from a friend and eight percent from their husband.

However, twenty-nine percent indicated that their friends never criticized them, nine percent that their husbands never did and eighteen percent never received criticism from their children.

When asked what things made them angry, mothers tended to give responses that fell into three main categories. The largest (thirty percent) consisted of the annoying behavior of other people, for example "someone does something idiotic," "people are hypocritical and snobbish."

The next largest (twenty-five percent) were responses where the source of anger was the child. And the third (twenty-one percent) were responses mentioning mistreatment of other people by someone, for example "I see someone mistreated."

Five percent of the mothers said they never got angry. Proving by the interviewer failed to produce any further response.

When asked how they reacted when they were angry, sixty-two percent of mothers said they would be verbally or even physically aggressive.

The next most favored response, but only by fourteen percent of the mothers, was to try to control or overcome their anger or at least not to show it openly. Nine percent indicated they would sulk or become grouchy.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age correlations.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was only one significant difference involving responses to the question concerning what things made mothers angry. Significantly more middle class parents indicated that mistreatment of other people made them angry.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The responses to these questions indicated that while mothers seem to take criticism much better from a friend than do their children, their response in an anger situation is still basically aggressive. This may well serve to explain the predominance of aggressive responses in the children of these mothers. Learning by imitation they choose the response most frequently observed by them.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Six out of a possible thirty-six correlations were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), defined as number of hobbies, and with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Initiation in Academic Task Achievement was correlated with Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Initiation in Task Achievement and Coping Effectiveness in the Nonacademic area, while Persistence in Academic Task Achievement was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in Nonacademic Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

One correlation out of the thirty possible was significant. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when the Authority figure was the mother.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

Only one out of the eighteen possible correlations was significant. Attitude Toward Task Achievement was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

Four out of a possible twelve correlations were significant, one positive and three negative. Initiation in Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Implementation in Anxiety. Attitude Toward Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area, while Persistence in Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness and negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

None of the twenty-four possible correlations in this area were significant.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

One out of the thirty possible correlations was significant. Initiation in Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when the problem was that of dealing with criticism by the mother.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

None of the possible eighteen correlations were significant.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

One correlation out of a possible twelve was significant. Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Eight out of the twenty-four correlations were significant, seven positive and one negative. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and the father. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with the father and the mother. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, while Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

Five correlations out of a possible fifteen were significant, four of them positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the mother was correlated positively with ability to cope when the child's feelings were hurt by another child but negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the father was correlated positively both with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children and when criticized by other children. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the father was correlated positively with Implementation in an Anxiety situation.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Six correlations out of a possible twenty were significant, four of them positive and two of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with both mother and father. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the father was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father, however, was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and the father.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Summary

In all, there were two hundred seventy-five correlations in this area. Of these, thirty-five were significant, seven of them negative and twenty-eight positive.

Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, six in all. It was correlated positively with Initiation, Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in the Nonacademic Task Achievement area, with Coping Effectiveness when punished by both father and mother and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father.

Three variables had five significant correlations with other variables. These were Coping Effectiveness when punished by the mother (four positive, one negative); Implementation in the Anxiety area (two positive, three negative) and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father (three positive, two negative).

Only one variable had no significant correlations with other variables. This was Coping Effectiveness in the Authority area when told to do something by the mother.

Interpretive Comments

Throughout the discussion of these correlations it should be remembered that all scores are based on the mother's report of her own and the child's behavior. The validity of this report will be the subject of another volume in which the child behavior reported in the interview and the child behavior assessed by tests and peer reports will be compared. However, for the purposes of this discussion it must be assumed that the mother's report has a reasonable validity. The interview questions were divided into four main areas--Child Behavior, Parent Behavior, Parent Treatment of Child and Parent Attitude. Correlations were computed within and across these areas to ascertain what, if any, relations existed between them.

The first area was child behavior. Within this, correlations were carried out of assessments of behavior in the six areas of Task Achievement, both Academic and Nonacademic, Interpersonal Relations, Authority, Aggression and Anxiety. It is interesting that of the fifteen different combinations resulting, ten produced one or no significant correlations. This would seem to indicate that good or bad behavior in one area is not necessarily related to the same type of behavior in another area.

Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, six in all. This result could be interpreted in two ways. Taking it at its face value it could be that the ability to cope with anger directed toward the mother is related to an ability to do well in the Nonacademic Task Achievement area. It would certainly seem to be related to the ability to cope when punished by parents as this must nearly always involve a certain amount of anger. In other words, the child who can control his temper in one situation is most likely to control it in another.

On the other hand, it may be that if a child gets along well with the mother there is a certain "halo" effect, the mother perceiving the child as doing well in other areas of behavior. However, if this were the case, perhaps more significant correlations would have been expected than actually occurred.

Significant relationships which might have been expected were those in the two areas of Task Achievement. Interestingly, the greater the number of hobbies the child had, the better he initiated coping behavior and coped effectively with academic problems; while Coping Effectiveness in the Nonacademic area was strongly related to a number of aspects of academic Coping Behavior.

This gives some support to the suggestions that have been made that children who do well academically also do well in Nonacademic areas and that the stereotype of the child who does nothing but study to get ahead is not a true one.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

Four correlations out of a possible eighteen were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with amount of satisfaction expressed by the parent over the child's Academic Task Achievement and with Parental Academic Aspiration. Initiation in Academic Task Achievement also was correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration; while Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with amount of satisfaction expressed by parent.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

Four out of the twelve correlations were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness, Initiation and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) all were correlated negatively with the parent's reasons for the child having jobs around the house, with emphasis on the child's personality development scoring high. Engagement also was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

There were two significant correlations out of eighteen, both of them negative. Initiation and Engagement in Academic Task Achievement were correlated negatively with Parent's Conception of the Major Function of School.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

Six correlations out of a possible eighteen were significant, three positive and three negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with amount of satisfaction expressed by the parent over the child's Academic Task Achievement and Parental Academic Aspiration. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents and negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with both Parental Initiation in Contacting School and Parental Academic Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

Three correlations out of twelve were significant, all of them negative. Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration while Implementation was correlated negatively with the reason for the child having a job around the house, emphasis on child's personality development scoring high.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

Three correlations out of a possible twelve were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the mother was correlated with Parental Academic Aspiration. Coping Effectiveness when punished and when criticized by the father was correlated with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over the child's Academic Task Achievement.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

One significant correlation out of ten was significant. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Authority x School - Table 24

Three correlations out of fifteen were significant, one positive and two negative. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the mother was correlated positively with Parental Conception of the major function of school. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother also was correlated negatively with this variable.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

Three out of the nine possible correlations were significant, two positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in contacting school while both Coping Effectiveness when criticized by another child and Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child were correlated positively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over the child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

One correlation out of six was significant. Coping Effectiveness, when criticized by other children, was correlated positively with reasons for the child having jobs around the house, emphasis on child's personality development scoring high.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

One correlation out of six was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

Three correlations out of a possible twelve were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and with friends were all correlated positively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parent over child's Academic Task Achievement.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 33

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Thirty-three correlations were significant out of the two hundred eight possible. Of these thirty-three, seventeen were negative and sixteen positive.

One of the Parent Attitude variables had the greatest number of significant correlations with other variables, ten in all. Amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness and negatively with Persistence in Academic Task Achievement; positively with Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic); positively with Coping Effectiveness when punished and when crititized by the father; positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children and when feelings were hurt by other children and positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and with friends.

Parental Academic Aspiration had the next highest number of significant correlations, six in all, three positive and three negative.

Seven Child Behavior variables had no significant correlations with other variables while only one Parent Attitude variable (Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School) had no significant correlations.

Interpretive Comments

There seemed to be quite a satisfactory amount of agreement between these two types of behavior at least in the Academic Achievement area. Parents with high Academic aspiration saw their children as initiating action in this area and coping well. As might be expected, parents who thought their child was achieving well saw them as persisting in Task Achievement situations.

However, the agreement in other areas was not so high, particularly for the Academic-Nonacademic relationship. In those cases where the parents placed stress upon the child's personality development as the reason for the child having a job around the house the child did not score highly on Coping Effectiveness, Initiation or Engagement in the Task Achievement area. A number of different interpretations could be placed upon these results. Parents whose children were not doing so well at school might feel that their personality should be developed in other directions or conversely feel that training them at home would help them settle down to their schoolwork.

On the whole, parents with a positive attitude toward their child's Academic Task Achievement saw them as coping efficiently in the other behavior areas.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

There were five significant correlations out of twelve, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork and in Homework. Engagement assessed on two different questions and Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) all were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

There were two significant correlations out of thirty, both of them positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Amount of Guidance given by parents in Interpersonal Relations, while Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

There was one significant correlation out of six. Attitude Toward

Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There was one significant difference out of twelve. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in homework.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

There were three significant correlations out of thirty, all of them positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Activity Level and Positive Affect mother-child interaction, while Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Anxiety situation. There were no other significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in a Nonacademic Task Achievement situation.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

Four correlations out of twenty-five were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when punished by the mother was correlated positively with Positive Affect father-child interaction. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated positively with Activity Level father-child interaction and Positive Affect mother-child interaction. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated positively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There was one significant correlation out of six. Coping Effectiveness when the child's feelings were hurt was correlated positively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

Two correlations out of a possible ten were significant, both of them negative. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Activity Level mother-child interaction and Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

One correlation out of two was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in the Anxiety area.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

There was one significant correlation out of sixteen. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general was correlated positively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Twenty-two out of the two hundred fifty-nine correlations were significant, nine of them negative and thirteen of them positive.

One of the Parent Treatment of Child variables had the greatest number of significant correlations, five in all. Parental Implementation in Homework was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness, Engagement measured on two questions and Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) and positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Of the Child Behavior variables, twelve out of the twenty-six had no significant correlations with other variables. Of the Parent Treatment of Child variables only one, Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), had no significant correlations.

Interpretive Comments

There were few significant relationships in these two areas and those which did occur were not those which might have been expected. When the parents helped a child with homework the child did not face up to problems, engage in them or cope as effectively in the Task Achievement areas as when the parent did nothing. A possible explanation of these unexpected results is that the parent felt that as the child was not doing well at school he needed to be helped at home.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

There were three significant correlations out of twenty-four, two of them negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general by the mother was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness in the Academic Task Achievement area. Coping Effectiveness by the mother when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with child's Engagement in Academic Task Achievement measured on two different questions.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

One correlation out of twenty-four was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated positively with child's Activity Level in Nonacademic Task Achievement, defined as number of organized groups belonged to.

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

There was one significant correlation out of twenty. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general was correlated positively with the child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general was correlated negatively with child's Coping Effectiveness with Anxiety.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

There was one significant correlation out of sixteen. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with child's Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There was one significant correlation out of six. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with child's Implementation in Nonacademic Task Achievement.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There were two significant correlations out of five. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother and when punished by the mother.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Eight out of one hundred thirty possible correlations were significant, three of them negative and five of them positive.

Two variables had three significant correlations with other variables. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with child's Engagement in Academic Task Achievement measured on two questions and negatively with child's Coping Effectiveness when angry. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when dealing with Aggression was correlated positively with child's Implementation in Nonacademic Task Achievement and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when punished and when disciplined by the mother.

Two out of the five Parent Behavior variables had no significant correlations, while fifteen of the twenty-six Child Behavior variables were not correlated significantly with other variables.

Interpretive Comments

There were very few significant relationships here. It had been expected that there would be some relationship between behavior patterns, particularly in the Aggression area as this would indicate that the child was behaving in a certain way as a result of imitating the mother. But such relationships were not found, especially in the Aggression area. In the area of Interpersonal Relations there was slightly more agreement with the ability of the mother to cope with criticism, correlating positively with the child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother but negatively with the child's Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

However, the mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression correlated with the child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized and punished by the mother. So although the relationships within actual areas were not always significant overall, there was some pattern of similarity.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There were no significant correlations between the two aspects of Parent Behavior investigated.

Interpretive Comments

There were no significant correlations between the two areas of parent behavior investigated, suggesting that the Coping Effectiveness dimension comprised a different ability in each case, as had occurred in the Child Behavior area.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her child was correlated negatively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parent over child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

There were two significant correlations out of the eight possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration and reason for the child having a job around the house, with emphasis on child's personality development scoring high.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

One correlation out of twelve was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Four out of the forty possible correlations were significant, two positive and two negative. Only one variable had more than one significant correlation. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with amount of satisfaction by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement and with Parental Occupational Aspiration. Of the five Parent Behavior variables, two had no significant correlations with other variables. Of the eight Parent Attitude variables, four had no significant correlations with other variables.

Interpretive Comments

No distinct pattern of relationship emerged here. It would seem that mothers who were able to cope well with criticism were more involved in the development of their child's personality, and aspiring to a job of high status for them.

However, at the same time they did not regard school as being of great importance.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

There were two significant correlations out of the eight possible, both of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband and by friends was correlated with Degree of Guidance given by parents in a Nonacademic Task Achievement situation.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

One significant correlation occurred out of a possible twenty. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only three correlations out of fifty were significant and, of these, none were for the Aggression area.

Interpretive Comments

As with the previous area, there was no distinct pattern of relationships but again mother's ability to cope with criticism showed some interesting relationships. Thus mothers scoring high on this variable gave more help to their children in Nonacademic Task Achievement situations and also participated in more activities with their children.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

Two correlations out of six were significant. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration while Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

Amount of satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school. There were no other significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Three correlations out of the twenty-one possible were significant, two of them negative and one positive.

Interpretive Comments

Parental Occupational Aspiration and Parental Academic Aspiration correlated highly indicating that parents realize the importance of a good educational background in seeking to gain high status in the occupational area.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

Two correlations out of ten were significant, one positive and one negative. Parental directedness in Task Achievement was correlated negatively, and Degree of Guidance by parents was correlated positively, with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

The only two significant correlations have already been discussed.

Interpretive Comments

Parental Directedness in Task Achievement correlated negatively with the amount of Positive Affect expressed in a mother-child situation. This situation is often seen in mother-child relationships where both mother and child, especially at age fourteen, tend to express Negative rather than Positive Affect when the mother makes an attempt to guide the child.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

Three correlations out of six were significant, two positive and one negative. Amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement and with Degree of Guidance by parents in a Nonacademic Task Achievement situation. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

Two correlations out of fifteen were significant, both of them positive. Amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated with Positive Affect mother-child interaction and with degree of guidance given by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

Three correlations out of four were significant, all of them positive. Reasons for the child having a job around the house was correlated positively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork and Homework. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

One correlation out of the ten possible was significant. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There were no significant correlations.

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

One correlation out of fifteen was significant. Parental Conception of the major function of school was correlated negatively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Nine correlations out of the eighty were significant, three of them negative and six of them positive. One variable had four correlations with other variables. Amount of satisfaction expressed by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement and Degree of Guidance given by parents in the same area. It also was correlated positively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction and Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Four out of the ten Parent Treatment of Child variables had no significant correlations with other variables while three of the eight Parent Attitude Variables had no significant correlations.

Interpretive Comments

Again there were few significant relationships. In this case, parental satisfaction with schoolwork correlated positively with parental guidance indicating that parents have made a distinction between the child's actual behavior in the Task Achievement situation and the way the parent assesses it, taking the child's level of ability into account.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Description of the Sample

As already indicated in the Introduction, the eighty mothers were sampled in such a way that there were ten mothers in each of the eight sub-groups, five of whose children were above the median on achievement scores and five of whom were below the median. Forty fathers were selected on the same basis so that there were five in each of the eight sub-groups. This meant that not only was the interview sample representative of the full sample, but the sample of fathers well represented that of the mothers.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

There were no significant differences between the mother and father frequencies in this area.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

The questions in this area were aimed at obtaining an assessment of parent's aspirations and expectations for the child.

An equal percentage of mothers and fathers wanted a university education for their children, while significantly more mothers than fathers wanted them to at least graduate from high school. The really big difference was in the area where the parent indicated that the child's preference was the most important variable. Forty-three percent of the fathers fell into this category while only fourteen percent of the mothers did so.

This question on educational aspiration was the only one to produce significant differences.

III. Nonacademic Activities

When asked what kind of things the child did with his father, there was a significant difference in reporting between mothers and fathers when activities were divided into nonverbal, verbal, constructive, negative and neutral. Nineteen percent of the mothers indicated that activities between father and child were of the type that fell into only one of these categories, while forty-five percent of the fathers indicated this.

IV. Authority

On the question of discipline mothers and fathers differed in their perception of the situation. While thirty-one percent of mothers said their husband did not discipline the child only thirteen percent of fathers indicated that they fell in this category.

Significant differences also occurred concerning the child's reaction to the father's punishment. Eight percent of the mothers said the child sulked or withdrew but twenty-eight percent of fathers indicated that this was how the child responded to their punishment. While thirty-six percent of mothers did not know what the child did when punished by the father, a significantly smaller percentage of fathers (fifteen percent) did not know either.

V. Interpersonal Relations

There were no significant differences in this section.

VI. Anxiety

There were no significant differences here but it seems worthwhile to call attention to the figures on the question "What kind of things does he worry about?" The percentages for fathers and mothers in each category were exactly the same.

VII. Aggression

The uniformity of agreement in the Anxiety area did not extend to this area. A significant difference occurred to the question of what made the child angry. Sixty-one percent of mothers said that their children were made angry by petty annoyances while only forty percent of fathers indicated that their children were made angry in this way.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

While fifteen percent of the mothers said they did nothing to see that the child got his homework done, thirty-eight percent of fathers said they did nothing. And while twenty percent of mothers indicated that it was not necessary to do anything as the child did it on his own, only five percent of the father's responses fell in this category.

II. Authority

There were no significant differences in this area.

III. Interpersonal Relations

Significantly more mothers did something to help their child get along with other children. Fifty-three percent of them encouraged social activity in some way while only twenty-eight percent of fathers fell in this category.

IV. Anxiety

There were no significant differences in this area.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

While a majority of mothers in the sample interviewed had not taken any courses or training since they left school, about half of the fathers had taken courses, most of them of the professional or vocational type. This was also true of those mothers who had taken courses.

Both fathers and mothers had taken these courses shortly after leaving school and most had completed the course and felt that they had gained from it.

II. Occupational Aspects

In England all forty fathers worked and forty-three out of the eighty mothers worked. When asked how they came to be in the kind of work they were in, seven percent of mothers and thirty-five percent of fathers said that they wanted that type of work, a sizable difference in percentage. Thirty-two percent of mothers and twenty percent of fathers mentioned financial returns as the reason for their choice of work. Into the rare response category fell sixty percent of mothers' responses and forty-five percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what their job was like, thirty-two percent of mothers and seventeen percent of fathers gave purely descriptive responses. Twenty-one percent of mothers and twenty-two percent of fathers gave evaluative responses in describing their job.

When asked how they felt about their work, seventy-four percent of mothers and sixty-seven percent of fathers gave positive affective responses. Neutral or ambivalent responses were given by twenty-five percent of mothers and twenty-seven percent of fathers.

When asked what they liked about their job, twenty-three percent of mothers and twenty percent of fathers mentioned being with friendly people or people they liked. Special characteristics of the job were mentioned by fifty-three percent of mothers and thirty-two percent of the fathers. Falling into the combined rare response category were twenty percent of the mothers' responses and forty percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what they disliked about their job, fourteen percent of mothers and twenty-two percent of fathers mentioned poor working conditions. Special characteristics of the job were mentioned by twenty-three percent of mothers and twenty percent of fathers. Fifty-one percent of the mothers and thirty-two percent of the fathers said that there was nothing that caused them to dislike the job.

When asked if they would do the same kind of work if they had it to do over, thirty-two percent of mothers and forty-five percent of fathers said they would not do the same kind of work. However, fifty-eight percent of mothers and forty-seven percent of fathers said they would choose the same kind of work.

When asked what they did when problems arose on the job, thirty-two percent of mothers and seventy percent of fathers said they would try to solve the problem themselves, a sizable difference indicating more independence on the part of the fathers. Thirty-five percent of the mothers and seventeen percent of the fathers said they would first try to solve the problem themselves and then seek help from supervisors. Into the rare response category fell thirty percent of mothers' responses and five percent of fathers' responses.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, forty-six percent of mothers and fifty-two percent of fathers mentioned good social relationships. Tolerance, understanding or respect was mentioned by thirty-five percent of mothers and ten percent of fathers. Into the combined rare response category fell sixteen percent of the mothers' responses and twenty-five percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what was the best way to get along with the boss or supervisor, sixteen percent of mothers and thirty-seven percent of fathers said the question was not applicable as they worked alone. Doing your work well was mentioned by forty-two percent of mothers and thirty-two percent of fathers. Twenty-three percent of the mothers' responses and twelve percent of fathers' responses fell into the combined rare response category.

III. Personal Characteristics

When parents were asked how they reacted to criticism, significantly more fathers (fifty-eight percent) than mothers (thirty-eight percent) indicated rational analysis while significantly more mothers (twenty-four percent) than fathers (eight percent) indicated that they disliked criticism or took it poorly.

The same type of response occurred when the criticism came from friends, twenty-six percent of mothers and fifty percent of fathers reacted with rational analysis.

When asked what made them angry, three of the categories produced significant differences. Twenty-four percent of mothers but only five percent of the fathers indicated that their child was a source of anger. Twenty percent of mothers but only three percent of fathers mentioned mistreatment of other people as a source of anger; while twenty-nine percent of mothers and sixty-three percent of fathers indicated that the annoying behavior of other people and work-related problems were their main source of anger.

IV. Occupational Values

Significantly more fathers (twenty-five percent) than mothers (eight percent) placed Self-Satisfaction as their first value.

GERMANY

INTRODUCTION

I

The German Parent Interview differed in some points from the other cross-national Parent Interviews:

1. Our interviews were carried out two years later than those in the other countries, i.e., April through June 1969.
2. We only interviewed mothers, not fathers.
3. Some items had been deleted in the German interview so that nothing can be said about interpersonal relations in the parent-child interaction area and about academic task achievement of mothers, and only little on personal characteristics of mothers.

Since Germany had combined Stage II and Stage III, mothers of those children were interviewed who had been tested with our modified Stage III instruments.

The following table shows the distribution of our parents in the eight cells for all three stations:

Stations	Variables								
	10				14				
	UW		UM		UW		UM		
	m	f	m	f	m	f	m	f	
H	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	27
Ko	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	28
Hd	2	4	2	3	4	3	3	4	25
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	80

H = Hannover
Ko = Koblenz
Hd = Heidelberg

UW = Upper Working
UM = Upper Middle

m = male
f = female

The mothers were chosen randomly at each station from each subgroup. Parents were contacted either by phone or by personal visit. Very few parents refused to be interviewed (five percent), and generally it was possible to get the consent for one of the following days after the first contact. Parents agreed mainly because they had been informed of the study by their children's having been tested before. Thus, what had been allowed by the head of the school should be "something serious." In order to be sure, however, some parents asked their children "Is that the man who tested you in school?" before letting the interviewer come in. He was in fact the same person as that testing in the classes.

All parents interviewed lived in the center of one of the three cities, the areas being equal to those from which the schools were chosen.

The general attitude of mothers toward the interview was quite positive, i.e., they were interested in the questions and frequently said more than necessary. Middle class mothers tended to answer more freely and naturally, whereas working class mothers often asked whether their replies could have any consequences on the school records.

The interviews were carried out by two graded psychologists, one in each station. Before the interview they met twice in order to go through the questions and to come to an agreement concerning their behavior in the interview situation. Then four pilot interviews were carried out by each in each station; thereafter they met again to come to a final "strategy." Two of the interviewers had had experience interviewing people during their practical courses as students in psychology, and one had already done interviews for an advertising service.

II.

During the last few years there have been a lot of publications in Germany on child-rearing practices, from workers in various fields such as psychologists, sociologists, teachers, and social workers. The works go from scientific studies to more journalistic views on the usefulness of the old traditional forms of education. Two English authors had some influence on the discussion in Germany, one with broad experience in practical education, the other a psycholinguist, who has stimulated many psychologists and sociologists to do similar research in Germany: A. S. Neill and B. Bernstein.

As to the methods for assessing child-rearing attitudes, most studies used questionnaires like the Parent Attitude Research Instrument by Schaefer and Bell, many of those using a short translated version of this instrument (e.g., Keil, W. and Keil, H., 1970). Kemmler (1960) and Kemmler and Heckhausen (1957, 1959) tried to get data on the independence training of German mothers by asking questions similar to those of Winterbottom. Wesley and Karr (1968) used the same set of questions for a comparison of American and German mothers.

Another approach is to ask children about their parents and their child-rearing attitudes and practices. This method, described by Bronfenbrenner, and Roe and Siegelman, has also been used in a variety of German studies (e.g., Hermann et. al., 1968; Minsel and Fittkau, 1971).

Concerning educational practices at home and in the school that can only be assessed by direct observation, we have few studies. Most research in this area was done by Tausch, R. and Tausch, A. M., from Hamburg University, summed up in their book on educational psychology (1970).

The influence of certain child-rearing attitudes on the children's behavior and personality was studied in a number of works, particularly by workers around Heckhausen on the development of motivation (Heckhausen, H., 1965; Heckhausen, et. al., 1966; Heckhausen and Kemmler, 1957; Heckhausen and Roelofsen, 1962; Heckhausen and Wagner, 1965), (Keil, W. and Keil, H., 1970), but also on cognitive variables (Hermann and Stapf, 1968, 1972) and certain personality dimensions like those in the Children Personality Questionnaire by Potter and Cattell (Seitz and Jankowski, 1969).

Generally one can say that no German study concerning the field of parent-child relations has up to now undertaken to get information in so many behavior areas on the child by the interview technique as the cross-national investigation, the results of which are presented below.

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE

Description of the Sample

The mothers came from three German towns with more than 100,000 inhabitants each: Hannover, Heidelberg, and Koblenz. Each of these three stations was equally represented in the sample, just as the distribution of the three variables age, sex and socioeconomic status (SES) was equally distributed.

About eighteen percent of the mothers interviewed said that both parents were responsible for caring for the child, whereas in seventy percent of the cases the main responsibility lay with the mother only. In four percent of the cases the father took the responsibility, and in the remaining eight percent it was other relatives, and parents and relatives, as those caring most for their children. Neither social class nor sex made any significant difference in this variable. However, a significant age difference was found here; many more mothers of fourteen-year-olds reported that mother and father were responsible for the child, whereas the ten-year-olds had a significantly larger number of the mother as the main person caring for them. This seems to indicate that German parents divide their responsibility, as children grow up.

Twenty-three percent of the mothers were born in the same town as that where they resided at the time of the interview, nineteen percent of the mothers came from a rural area, sixteen percent were born in an adjacent Bundesland, whereas eighteen percent were born in a distant Bundesland. Twenty-four percent of the mothers had their birthplace in East Germany or in areas being Polish today (e.g., Silesia, East Prussia, Pomerania). No significant sex or age differences in the birthplace of the mother were found. However, the two social classes differed significantly as to the number of mothers who were born in a distant Bundesland. That is, significantly more mothers from the upper-middle class came from a distant Bundesland as compared with mothers from the upper-lower class. This trend also showed up in relation to the category "birthplace in an adjacent Bundesland," where the social class difference was almost significant.

Thirty percent of the fathers were born in the same town, twenty percent had their birthplace in a rural area and twenty-one percent came from East Germany. There were no significant differences in any of the three variables.

Forty-six percent of the mother ages were between forty and forty-four at the time of the interview, eleven percent of the mothers (only of ten-year-olds) were between twenty-five and thirty-four, while twenty-four percent were between thirty-five and thirty-nine. Neither class, sex, nor age revealed meaningful significant differences in the distribution of the ages of the mothers.

Nineteen percent of the fathers came in the age range twenty-five to thirty-nine, thirty percent were aged forty to forty-four, while twenty-nine percent were in the range forty-five to forty-nine. The remaining twenty-two percent were aged fifty and above. Significant differences between class, sex or age groups did not occur.

Seventy-eight percent of the mothers had no paid occupation, i.e., they were housewives. The number was fairly equally distributed on the three variables.

Since grading of occupation had been built into the sample selection the significant class difference on the question concerning fathers' occupation was to be expected.

As to mothers' education, thirty-three percent of the upper-middle class had graduated from Gymnasium (Abitur), twenty-three percent had additional university studies, whereas the percentages for the upper-lower classes were eight and three percent, respectively. These differences were very significant and even more significant if one looks at the numbers for the Realschule (secondary school): only five percent of the upper-lower class mothers were secondary school graduates, as compared to forty-five percent of the upper-middle class mothers. Eighty-eight percent of upper-lower class mothers had only attended the Volksschule (elementary school), while only one-fifth of the upper-middle sample of mothers were Volksschule graduates without any further school education. These differences were also very significant.

For the fathers the picture was quite similar: seventy-five percent of upper-middle class fathers were Gymnasium graduates, and fifty-eight percent studied at the university. About the same number of upper-lower class fathers (seventy-eight percent) had only attended the Volksschule. Both differences were very significant. As to the Realschule, approximately the same number of fathers from both classes (twenty percent) had this education.

Fifty-four percent of the children in this sample had never been in the hospital, thirty-five percent have been in the hospital once, and ten percent twice. Since time for all admissions for those who had been in the hospital was quite low, one can say that time spent in the hospital had no great effect on the child's behavioral development in our sample. One age difference was found: fourteen-year-olds had significantly more often been in the hospital than ten-year-olds.

In eighty-four percent of the cases neither mother nor father had been absent from home for six months or more and in fourteen percent of the sample the fathers had been living away from home for half a year or more. There were no significant age, sex or social class differences in whether or not one or more parents had been away for a longer period.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

This series of questions in the interview was aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his manner of tackling academic problems as perceived by the mother.

Whereas forty-three percent of the mothers believed that their child's achievement was average or barely above average, forty-one percent reported that their children showed a performance definitely above average and sixteen percent thought their child to be below average or unsatisfactory. Sixty-three percent of the mothers said their child had a positive attitude toward school, while another nine percent thought that the child had strong positive attitudes toward school. Only ten percent reported that the child had negative feelings and eighteen percent saw their son or daughter as having neutral or ambivalent feelings toward school.

Many mothers (forty percent) said that doing homework had high priority, i.e., it was done immediately upon coming home, while thirty percent reported that it was done at a regular time, i.e., after dinner or some other occupation. Ten percent tried to avoid or put off their homework, and the remainder did or usually did their homework without any specification given by the mother. Forty-eight percent of the children did not have to be reminded to do their homework. Eighteen percent needed an occasional reminder, and nine percent had to be pushed. Nineteen percent of mothers responded by describing the child's affective response rather than initiation or lack of it.

Only one percent always puts off homework to do other things, nine percent frequently did this and nineteen percent did it sometimes. The great majority of the children, however, seldom (thirty-four percent) or never (thirty-six percent) put off their homework.

Thirty-nine percent of the children would start again with no display of emotion when they discovered that they had done their homework the wrong way. Forty percent would start again after expressing either unhappiness or anger. Only one child would have to be made to start again, three percent would not start over, while nine percent would seek aid or advice, and four percent would show anxiety without indication of a solution of the problem.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences in this area.

3. Sex

The mothers of girls reported more often than mothers of boys that their child had positive attitudes and/or feelings about schoolwork. This difference was very significant in our sample.

With regard to putting off homework to do other things, mothers of girls said significantly more often that their child never did this.

Further, boys significantly more often got angry than did girls when they had to start over their homework after having found that they had done it the wrong way, according to their mothers' statements.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Only sixteen percent of the mothers thought their child's performance to be below average or unsatisfactory. Compared with the actual distribution of school grades there seemed to be a tendency for mothers to generally overestimate their child's achievement in school or to describe him in a more favorable light than was actually true.

German children, on the whole, apparently like going to school and doing their homework regularly without putting it off, and start the homework over when it was being done wrong, i.e., they seemed to be rather achievement oriented and independent.

It cannot be overlooked, however, that these qualities apply especially to girls. This finding supported observations of school teachers, that girls were not more intelligent than boys, but easier to work with, already in the first years of school.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

The questions in this area were aimed at obtaining an assessment of the parents' aspirations and expectations for the child.

There was a certain discrepancy between the mother's educational aspiration for the child and her expectation of the same child's performance. Whereas seventy-five percent would like their child to become a University graduate or to leave Gymnasium with the Abitur, sixty-one percent really expected he would do this. Concerning the other extreme of the educational scale, only four percent would like to see their child leaving school at fourteen to fifteen years of age, but eighteen percent of the mothers thought that their child would not go farther.

Thirty-three percent of the mothers stated that they wished for their child to have a job classified at socioeconomic status levels one and two, the two highest levels. Fifteen percent preferred their child to have a level three type of job and three percent indicated a preference for their child to have a level four type job. Level five and six type jobs were not named by any mother. Twenty-one percent indicated they would leave the decision to the child and would accept any job that made him happy.

On the negative side mothers did not want their child to have a job with a low status: twenty-four percent indicated this. Thirty-six percent mentioned a specific occupation, approximately half of these naming a high-level profession, and half of them naming middle status jobs. A relatively high percentage of mothers gave "don't know" as a response (twenty-six percent).

When mothers were asked what type of work they thought their child would like to take up, more than fifty percent mentioned a job classified at socioeconomic status level two, eight percent named a job with the highest status and no mother mentioned level five and six jobs. Eleven percent gave a "don't know" response.

When asked about the occupation they felt their child would probably have, sixty percent said they never had thought about it or they had no specific preference.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was a very significant difference between mothers of the two age groups: the number of mothers of ten-year-olds who would like a Gymnasium with Abitur for their child was much greater than the number of mothers of fourteen-year-olds.

In the occupational area there were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic status

Whereas the two social classes did not differ significantly concerning the mothers' wish to let their children make the Abitur, or to let them study at the University, there was a very significant difference when one considers the next three educational levels: upper-lower class mothers preferred that their children attend the Volksschule (elementary school) or the Realschule (secondary school).

When parents were asked how far they thought their child would go in school, twenty-five of the upper-lower mothers, but none of the upper-middle class named the Realschule. This was also a very significant difference.

In the occupational area there was no difference between the classes concerning job preference of mothers for their children. However, when asked what type of work mothers felt their child probably would do later, significantly more upper-lower class mothers mention a level two job.

3. Sex

Significantly more mothers of male subjects than of female subjects gave "no preference" answers, when asked to name the job their child actually would have when he grew up.

More mothers of males named a specific profession as a job they would not like their child to have when grown up.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Though overall interpretations may indicate some general trends it seems more appropriate, when interpreting statistical data in this area, to go directly to the differences between the main groups in order to give an interpretation that makes sense and does not conceal real differences. To give an example, one would come to a misinterpretation of the results, that only four percent of the mothers would like to see their child leaving school at fourteen to fifteen years, but eighteen percent were convinced that their child would not go farther, if one did not know that this eighteen percent referred almost completely to mothers of fourteen-year-old children who were in the Volksschule (elementary school).

Due to our school system these pupils generally leave school to work as apprentices. After the fourth grade, i.e., at ten to eleven years of age, German children have to decide between one of three school types: the Volksschule (elementary school) ending with grade nine/ten, the Realschule (secondary school) ending with grade ten and the Gymnasium ending with grade thirteen (Abitur).

Thus, it was clear that more mothers of ten-year-olds would like the Gymnasium for their child than mothers of fourteen-year-olds, because for a ten to eleven-year-old boy or girl in the Volksschule or Realschule the chance was much greater to get into the Gymnasium than for fourteen-year-old children.

Inversely, the chance for a fourteen-year-old child in the Gymnasium to get the Abitur is much greater than for a ten-year-old one. This may explain the uncertainty of mothers of the younger age group when asked for their educational expectations for their children.

Though one can no longer say today that only upper-middle class parents aspired to the Abitur and the University for their children, the results showed clearly that, for the upper-lower class, the Volksschule and the Realschule were still the most preferred educational goals, with respect to aspiration as well as expectation, compared with the goals of the upper-middle class.

More upper-middle than upper-lower class mothers and more mothers of male than of female subjects said that they had no preference or never thought about the question, when asked to name the job their child actually would have later.

This result could indicate a certain lack of interest but also this seems to be more evidence concerning the two groups of mothers, more freedom for their children's decisions.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

Only one mother could not report any extra-curricular activities of her child, while the remainder were able to list at least one activity, and almost seventy percent of the mothers mentioned three or more activities outside of school.

When asked what sort of interactions occurred between themselves and the child, forty-nine percent of the mothers reported nonverbal joint activities or described a positive affective interaction of a non-specified nature ("We enjoy each other"). Approximately one-fourth (twenty-four percent) reported simple verbal interaction between mother and child, while three percent indicated negative affect or absence of interaction. Twenty-three percent described constructive activities like cleaning the house.

Church or other religious activities and outings (twenty-three percent) seemed to still play a role besides household activities (fourteen percent), conversation (twenty-five percent) and indoor activities plus homework (thirty-three percent). More than fifty percent of the mothers shared at least two activities with the child.

Activities with the father followed a similar pattern, the highest percentage (sixty percent) being for nonverbal non-work activity or positive affective interaction. Eighteen percent reported a simple verbal interaction between father and child, and four percent indicated negative interaction. Nearly forty percent of the children shared religious activities or outings with their father, while thirty-five of the mothers mentioned indoor activities or homework.

In response to questions concerning the child's affiliation with clubs, organizations or groups, forty-six percent said their child did not belong to any clubs or organized groups, thirty-eight percent named sports clubs, but only eleven percent of the mothers referred to organized groups such as scouts.

When asked whether their child had any lessons thirty-one percent mentioned cultural pursuits (music, art) and twenty-four percent indicated their child had no classes. Thirteen percent mentioned academic classes, sixteen percent sports, ten percent hobbies such as photography and six percent such classes as typing or cooking.

Thirty-nine percent mentioned dishwashing as jobs or chores around the house, followed by general help (eighteen percent) and cleaning house (sixteen percent). Eight percent of the mothers said their child had no job or chore around the house.

Nearly half of the children had to be reminded always or frequently to do their chores, thirty percent sometimes, nine percent seldom and eight percent never.

Sixty-three percent did their chores without asking for assistance from anyone else, though only four percent always helped around the house without being asked. Forty percent, however, sometimes helped without being asked.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more mothers of fourteen-year-old children mentioned "talking" and "conversation" as main activities with the mother, whereas very significantly more mothers of ten-year-old children said a nonverbal non-work activity was the main interaction.

Concerning activities with the father no significant age difference was found.

Significantly more fourteen-year-old children seemed to help frequently around the house than ten-year-olds, according to their mothers.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The question concerning lessons or classes of the child produced two significant class differences. Significantly more upper-middle class children had cultural, study, music or art lessons or classes, whereas significantly more upper-lower class children had none of these.

Significantly more children of lower status families helped frequently around the house without being asked than did upper class children. There were no other social class differences observed.

3. Sex

A very significant difference between boys and girls of this sample concerned the kind of interaction between them and their mothers. More mothers of girls than of boys emphasized constructive activities. Significantly more girls than boys had household activities with the mothers.

Concerning interaction with the fathers there was no significant difference between the two sex groups.

Significantly more mothers of girls said that their child cleaned house when asked for jobs or chores around the house.

Significantly more boys than girls helped at home with the family only, whereas significantly more girls than boys had jobs or chores referring to personal items as well as to the family.

Boys had to be reminded, according to their mothers, to a significantly higher percentage than did girls to do the jobs or chores around the house.

c. Summary and Interpretation

On the whole one can say that, if one takes number and type of non-academic activities between parents and children as an index of the family cohesion, the family ties appeared to be rather stable.

Religious activities, however, seemed to excite interest only with the younger age group or, otherwise expressed, parents of fourteen-year-olds apparently did not care as much about their children going to church than did the parents of ten-year-olds.

It is interesting that, concerning interaction with fathers, there were no differences between any of the groups, whereas the relation to the mothers produced some age, class and sex differences. It seems that with decreasing amount of interaction (father's absence during the day) the differences between fathers' interactive patterns became smaller.

The fact that more mothers of girls than of boys emphasized positive affective relations seemed to be in line with traditional educational goals, according to which boys should be reared with "less feeling" than girls. Such more traditional views concerning sex roles show up also in the finding that more girls than boys have household activities.

No differences between boys and girls, however, were found concerning the child's affiliation with clubs and organizations, i.e., outside the house.

Whereas here we found no class differences, there was a very significant difference between upper-lower and upper-middle class children as to membership in cultural, study or art lessons. The interest of working class parents to send their children to such lessons and classes seemed to be very low, the costs playing a role here certainly too.

Washing was the job most frequently done by the children of this sample (seventy-three percent), whether it was the dishes, the car or the windows. This inclination to cleanliness, however, was apparently stronger with the mothers than with the children, for half of these had to be reminded always or frequently and still thirty percent had to be reminded sometimes to do their chores, boys being less willing to do them by themselves than girls.

That more fourteen-year-olds than ten-year-olds helped frequently around the house without being asked could be expected, even though there was a significant class difference, according to which working class mothers apparently value housework by their children more than middle class mothers.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

Twenty-one percent of the mothers indicated that their child showed a positive acceptance ("tries to improve") when corrected by the mother. Twenty-eight percent said he would accept the correction without either positive or negative affect. Only one mother said he would refuse her, whereas fourteen percent mentioned a negative acceptance ("grumbles but does it") on the part of the child. Thirteen percent believed that the child would show an emotional reaction (acceptance not being implied) and also thirteen percent indicated that it would all depend on the situation the child was in at the time.

When asked how the child reacted to punishment of various sorts twenty-nine percent of the mothers said the child accepted the punishment and corrected his behavior, three percent indicated that their child showed no overt reaction and stayed quiet. Thirty-three percent said he withdrew from the situation or sulked. Hostile verbal or nonverbal behavior was indicated in fourteen percent of the cases while nine percent reacted by crying.

As a second response describing the child's reaction to punishment, twenty-four percent of the mothers mentioned that the child took it well or apologized.

When asked how the child reacted to punishment by the father, around forty percent of the mothers said as a first response that the child took the punishment well and corrected the behavior. Three percent described the child as engaging in no overt reaction and twenty-five percent described the child as sulking or withdrawing. Eight percent reacted by crying, six percent described the child as expressing hostile verbal and nonverbal behavior.

The main responses to mother's criticism fell into three categories: positive acceptance (twenty-one percent), to get hurt and cry (twenty-one percent), and to resort to positive verbal behavior (twenty-three percent). An additional fourteen percent of the mothers indicated that their child sulked or withdrew.

Much of the same picture was shown when mothers were asked how the child reacted to father's criticism. Twenty-four percent described their son or daughter as accepting it, nearly thirty percent said the child got hurt or cried and fourteen percent indicated that he sulked or withdrew. Eight percent laughted it off or ignored it while nine percent reacted in a defensive verbal manner.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more ten than fourteen-year-olds were reported as getting hurt or crying when critized by their mothers; this difference does not show up when reaction to the criticism of father was considered.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Whether the mother or the father was the authority figure, a relatively high percentage of children showed positive acceptance or a neutral behavior when corrected or punished by either of the parents. Overt emotional reactions or hostile behavior in any form happened not so often, at least not as first response in the punishment situation.

When criticized by the parents the tendency of children not to engage in defensive verbal or verbal rational actions was even stronger than in the punishment situation. Apart from one age difference it was found that there was a very similar behavior pattern of all children, whether they differed in age, socioeconomic status or sex, in response to authority figures: obeying and holding back critical responses.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked if the child had a regular job outside of the home, three-fourths said no. Six percent said yes and the remainder either gave irrelevant or no information.

The other questions concerning this area were deleted in the German mother interview.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

In the area of interpersonal relations criticism by friends or siblings produced in fifty-five percent of the cases reactions such as getting hurt, arguing or even stronger ones like verbal shouts and physical fights. Only four percent reacted positively. Thirty percent of the mothers, however, said that their child was not criticized by other children. Eighteen percent said they didn't know what the child did when criticized.

When the mothers were asked for an evaluation of the success of the child's interpersonal relations, seventy percent of the mothers stated that their child got along average with other children, sixteen percent reported that the child's interpersonal relations were very good and only eleven percent indicated that he got on poorly with others. When asked to describe the child's behavior, twenty-eight percent of the mothers reported that their child was bossy and assertive and three percent said their boy or girl had very close or long time friends. Four percent described their child as being independent ("stands up for himself"), while ten percent described him as being gregarious and liking company. Forty percent said they did not know how he got along with other children.

When asked about peer influence, more than half the sample denied any influence, six percent thought the influence was good, and nine percent thought it was bad. Sixteen percent acknowledged an influence, but without indication of whether good or bad.

When asked how the child reacted to having his feelings hurt, nearly fifty percent said that the child showed hostile affect, verbal hostility or physical aggression. Five percent attempted, according to the mothers, to cope by thinking or trying to understand why the other person hurt his feelings. Twenty-one percent of the mothers reported their child ignored the situation or withdrew, while sixteen percent said that the child became depressed or anxious.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was a very significant difference concerning mothers' evaluation of their children's success in getting along with other children: fifty-three percent of the mothers of ten-year-olds, but eighty-five percent of the mothers of fourteen-year-olds, described their child's interpersonal relations as being average.

When the children's behavior had to be described by the mothers, again very significantly more mothers of the ten-year-olds described them as being assertive, bossy or dominating.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

The type of reaction to criticism by other children differentiated boys and girls; for strong reactions like verbal shouts, quarrels and physical fights. Significantly more boys than girls reacted in this manner.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The interpersonal relations, generally seemed, according to the mothers, neither very good nor very bad. When criticized by other children or having their feelings hurt, most of the boys and girls in this sample showed reactions that cannot be classified as good coping answers, and when asked to describe their child's behavior, more than a quarter of the mothers reported that their child was bossy and assertive, whereas only ten percent emphasized that he liked company of many children.

Ten-year-old children seemed to be especially assertive and dominating compared with the older age group, and this was certainly one reason that their interpersonal relations were reported as being poor.

Verbal shouts, quarrels, and physical fights still seemed to be reserved for boys, their reactions to criticism being much stronger than those of girls, certainly the result of educational practices with respect to sex roles.

VII. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

Eighty percent of the sample reacted to worry by talking about the worry with someone else. Only eight percent of the mothers indicated that their child showed depressed or anxious affect.

A similarly high concentration of responses on one category was shown when mothers were asked what kinds of things the child worried about. Two-thirds said it was academic problems such as homework and grades, thirteen percent mentioned youth problems, while death, war, and health were mentioned by five percent.

When their children were worried, ten percent of mothers reported that they did not turn to others for help. Sixty-six percent of them specified the mother as the "helper," and nineteen percent the father or both parents.

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Many children worried about academic problems.

The majority of children turned to someone and talked with him about the worry, the mother being the favorite person, compared with the father and other family members. One has to consider, however, that the father was absent during the day and thus rarely had any possibility to help the child in anxiety situations.

VIII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

In response to queries concerning sources of anger in the child, thirty-four percent of the mothers mentioned petty everyday annoyances inflicted upon him by others. The cause next most frequently mentioned was people's immoral or unethical behavior toward the subject (twenty-eight percent), followed by control by the parents or other authority figures (nine percent), and own behavior (eight percent).

In response to questioning concerning the child's behavior when angry, around thirty percent reported that the child showed verbal expression of hostility ("curses someone out," "talks back"). Approximately twenty percent described the child as physically aggressive against another person, animal or object and eleven percent as showing hostile or aggressive affect. Three percent indicated that their child attempted to cope actively with the source of the problem or anger-producing situation. Ten percent thought their child withdrew from the situation.

Whereas thirty percent of the mothers said that, when angry at her, the child engaged in verbal aggression against her, this reaction was shown only by less than half of the children (thirteen percent) when angry at their father. Next follows as a reaction withdrawal and leaving the physical situation (with mothers, twenty percent; with fathers, sixteen percent). Generally, behavior toward the father in this situation was more differentiated (more categories of behavior mentioned) and concentrated less on certain categories, leaving the other ones with frequencies of one to three cases, as was true for the behavior toward mothers.

When questioned as to the child's reaction to a friend being angry with him, twenty-three percent of the mothers indicated that the child showed hostile emotional reactions without any other action and twenty percent reported that the child left the friend's presence. Nine percent, however, denied such a situation and no mother indicated that the child engaged in some sort of hostile overt behavior.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was one significant class difference concerning the cause of anger with the children: more upper-middle class than upper-lower class mothers reported that the child became angry when treated immorally or unethically by other people.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Active coping in an anger-producing situation apparently is one of those reactions not valued highly in our culture, for few mothers reported that the child attempted to cope actively with the source of the problem, when angry. Instead aggressive affect, verbal aggression or physically aggressive acts were reported.

Toward the mother, verbal aggression is dared much more frequently than toward the father. On the other hand, reactions toward the father include a broader range, i.e., the behavior is more differentiated, probably according to the degree of freedom the father is willing to concede to his child's responses. Expressed otherwise, the reactions to the mother are easier to predict than those toward the fathers.

The result that more upper-middle class children than upper-lower class children were reported to become angry when treated immorally or ethically by other people might reflect a frequently found difference between mothers' child rearing practices: upper class mothers tend to emphasize much earlier and more strongly in their education that children become aware of the motives, feelings and values of other people's behavior, whereas working class mothers rather tend to select the immediately perceived effects of an action as being important.

Parent/Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When mothers were asked to estimate how well their children were doing in school, fifty-five percent did not respond with any direct indication of how satisfied they were with their child's school performance. Around thirty percent indicated they were satisfied with their child's school achievement and only fifteen percent were dissatisfied with it.

Nearly sixty-eight percent of the mothers tried to encourage their child in his schoolwork, whereas thirty-two percent reported they did nothing. Supportive actions were helping with homework and encouraging the child through the use of academically supportive actions.

When it came to helping with homework fifty-nine percent of mothers did nothing, either because the child did it on his own or because the responsibility was left to him or because he received a detention at school if he did not do his homework.

Only one mother mentioned deprivation, punishment or rewards, and twenty-five percent had to remind their child occasionally or frequently. Only six percent of the mothers checked the child's work.

Nearly all mothers felt that school was the most or very important, mainly for education and teaching in general (seventy-three percent). Six percent said the school's job was to maintain discipline and to keep order. Eleven percent saw it as a preparation for life and a job.

More than half of the sample said preparation for life was the main reason for the importance of school. Nearly twenty percent mentioned academic and ten percent socioeconomic reasons.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was a very significant age difference: many more mothers of fourteen-year-olds (fifty percent) indicated that they did nothing to encourage their child in his schoolwork, but only fifteen percent of mothers of ten-year-olds gave this response.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was a rather strong, almost significant difference between the two classes concerning satisfaction of mothers with their children's school achievement: more upper-middle class than upper-lower class mothers indicated dissatisfaction with school achievement.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Although one-third of the mothers did nothing to encourage their child in his schoolwork, one should not overlook the fact that these were, to a great extent, mothers of fourteen-year-old children, who, as was explained earlier, had already chosen one of the three main school types, whereas the mothers of ten-year-olds still did a lot to get their child in the Gymnasium or at least the Realschule, and to let them stay there, i.e., their motivation to support the children was relatively higher than later, when the children are fourteen.

The same was probably true concerning homework, though one reason for lacking help from the parents might be the growing difficulty for them to understand the new methods and rules in all subjects, especially in mathematics.

Few parents gave active help or assistance. The lack of enough school psychologists counseling parents as to the right form of support and of eliciting achievement motivation with the children was partly responsible for such findings.

Nearly seventy percent of the mothers defined the school's job as educating and teaching in general. It must be mentioned, however, that the German word for education "erziehen" has also the connotation of "maintaining discipline" and "keeping order," so that the six percent in this category might be a bit too low. This would mean that quite a number of mothers till took the viewpoint that the school should be in the first place a help for them in teaching discipline and order.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

When they want their child to do something, ten percent of the mothers gave him a rational explanation or talked it over with him. Nearly fifty-five percent said that a mild request was all that was necessary, whereas direct orders or demands with punishments were used by twenty-nine percent of mothers.

Nearly three-quarters of the mothers (seventy-four percent) indicated that they would demonstrate or explain the correct way, when they found their child was doing a job incorrectly. Fifteen percent said that they would make him do it over, and only a minority would tell him off (eight percent) or punish the child (three percent).

When asked how they disciplined or punished their child, mothers gave a wide variety of responses. Nineteen percent used physical punishment, while deprivation of privileges was used by eighteen percent as was mild verbal reproof. Sixteen percent resorted to strong verbal behavior or threats, while eight percent deprived the child of movement, keeping him either in his room or in the house. Ten percent mentioned discussion or praise while six percent indicated they never punished their child.

When the authority figure was the father, ten percent did not discipline or punish. Twenty-one percent used mild verbal reproof while twenty percent used strong verbal behavior or threats. Fifteen percent of fathers tried discussion or praise as a means of discipline and fourteen percent preferred physical punishment. While thirteen percent made use of deprivation of privileges, only four percent tried deprivation of movement.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was a significant age difference on one of the types of punishment used by the father. Significantly more fathers of ten-year-olds used physical punishment than did fathers of fourteen-year-olds.

2. Socioeconomic Status

More upper-lower class mothers used a mild request method when they wanted the child to do something.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The answers to these questions seemed a bit unrealistic, especially if one looks at some of the responses to other items concerning authority. It could have been that the factor of social desirability influenced the reactions of the mothers.

III. Interpersonal Relations

The questions concerning interpersonal relations in the parent-child interaction area was deleted in the German mother interview.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked what the mother did when the child was worried, a high percentage of mothers (forty-six percent) said they tried to support and/or reassure him. Around twenty-four percent of the mothers indicated that they advised the child to take direct action such as going to the source of the problem and attempting to resolve it. Four percent of the mothers said they gave no advice. Five percent advised the child to simply accept the situation.

b. Significant Differences

There were no significant age, class or sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Most parents thought that support and reassurance was the best way to reduce anxiety when their child was worried. Only one quarter recommended to their child an action directed toward the source of the problem.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

The questions concerning academic task achievement of parents was deleted in the German mother interview.

II. Occupational Aspects

a. Description of Frequencies

Seventy-five percent of the sample of mothers were not working or were housewives. Of those who did work, most mothers worked because of family pressure or family trade or, to a lesser degree, because they wanted the type of work in which they were engaged. Very few took the job because of financial returns or external factors like accident or convenient location.

When asked if they would choose the same type of work if they could choose again, around two-thirds of those who did work gave a positive response, while approximately one-third said no.

When faced with problems in the job situation half of the working mothers solved the problem by themselves, whereas the other half of mothers sought help from co-workers or supervisors.

The best way to get along with fellow workers was, for most of the working mothers (seventy percent), the maintenance of good social relationships, while the best way to get along with the boss was, for about one-third of the working mothers, to do the work well and to follow instructions. Fifteen percent said they worked alone and the remainder gave unclassifiable answers.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences, either concerning the number of mothers who did not work or concerning the responses to any of the questions for those who did work.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

A summary is not necessary, because the few results are self-explanatory. An interpretation is problematic because the findings are based on too small a number of cases.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

When mothers were asked how they reacted to criticism by their own child, thirty-five percent of them mentioned rational analysis, including the separation of justified from unjustified criticism ("It all depends" statements). Twenty percent of the mothers said they engaged in rational verbal behavior with the child ("we talk it over") and fifteen percent reported they took it well. Thirteen percent claimed that they were never criticized by their child. About the same percentage of mothers (four percent) reacted in one of the following manners: ignoring, getting hurt or depressed, laughing criticism off, or defensive verbal behavior.

The questions concerning the mother's reactions to criticism by the husband and friends as well as the reasons for being angry and the reaction to anger were deleted in the German mother interview.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

A rational analysis including separation of justified from unjustified criticism was most often reported by mothers when criticized by their children. Unfortunately, there were no questions asking how often criticism was generally unjustified from the viewpoint of the mothers, and what they did in such cases. Only fifteen percent reported that they took the child's criticism well, sixteen percent showed bad coping reactions and thirteen pretended they were never criticized by their children, upper-lower class mothers being in the majority here as compared with upper-middle class mothers.

One-fifth of the sample, however, engaged in rational verbal behavior with the child, a reaction that must be classified as good coping, in addition to the rational analysis.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Introduction

A number of questions were omitted from the German interview schedule and therefore there was no data on a number of the variables used in the correlation analysis. In the accompanying tables this has been indicated by a stroke through the appropriate cells.

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Three correlations out of a possible thirty were significant, one negative and two positive. Initiation and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated positively with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

There was one significant correlation out of thirty. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

There was one significant correlation out of eighteen. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

Two correlations out of twelve were significant, one positive and one negative. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area and negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

Five correlations out of twenty-four were significant, four positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness, Initiation and Engagement (assessed on two different questions) in Task Achievement (Academic) were all correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Three correlations out of twenty-five were significant, all of them negative. Activity Level, defined both as number of organized groups belonged to and as number of hobbies, was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Five correlations out of twenty were significant, all of them positive. Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined both by mother and by father. Implementation and Initiation (assessed on two questions) in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

Three correlations out of fifteen were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated both with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

Two correlations out of ten were significant, both of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father and by the mother were correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Six correlations out of twenty were significant, three positive and three negative. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated positively both with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression and when angry with the father.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

Two correlations out of twelve were significant. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated degatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall thirty-three correlations were significant out of the two hundred fifty-five possible. Thirteen were negative and twenty positive. Three variables had five significant correlations with other variables. They were Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, with the father and with friends.

Two variables, Attitude Towards Task Achievement (Academic) and Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother, had no significant correlations with other variables.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

Three correlations out of eighteen were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Parental Satisfaction with the Child's Academic Task Achievement and with Parental Academic Aspiration. Attitude Towards Task Achievement (Academic) also was positively correlated with Parental Satisfaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

Two correlations out of eighteen were significant, one positive and one negative. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School, while Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the Major Functions of School, where a high score placed emphasis on the Academic Task Achievement function.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

Four correlations out of fifteen were significant, one positive and three negative. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was positively correlated with Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement. Implementation and Initiation (assessed on two separate questions) were correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

One correlation out of five was significant. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

There was one significant correlation out of fifteen. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively with Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x School - Table 24

There was one significant correlation out of fifteen. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

Two correlations out of nine were significant, one negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children was correlated negatively and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated positively with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, a high score placing emphasis on Academic Task Achievement.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were two significant correlations out of six, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, while Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated positively with Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

There was one significant correlation out of fifteen. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father was correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 33

There were three significant correlations out of twelve, all positive. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father and with the mother was correlated with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, where a high score placed emphasis on the Academic Task Achievement Function.

Summary

Overall twenty correlations out of one hundred seventy-eight were significant, seven of them negative and thirteen positive. Parental Conception of the major function of school had most significant correlations with other variables, seven in all (three negative and four positive). It was correlated negatively with Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child and with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area. It was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children, with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression and Coping Effectiveness when angry with both father and mother.

Seven Child Behavior variables and two Parent Attitude variables had no significant correlations.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

Six correlations out of twelve were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness, Attitude, Initiation and Engagement (assessed on two different questions) all were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework, while Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

There were no significant differences.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic x Anxiety - Table 37

There was one significant correlation out of six. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There were two significant correlations out of ten, both of them positive. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated positively both with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork and Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

There were two significant correlations out of ten, both of them negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) assessed on two different questions was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Two correlations out of twenty-four were significant, both of them negative. Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction, while Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 41

There was one significant correlation out of five. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

There was one significant correlation out of six. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

Only one correlation out of two was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

There were three significant correlations out of sixteen, one positive and two negative. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction, Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction, while Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated positively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall twenty correlations out of two hundred twenty-eight were significant, fourteen negative and six positive. Parental Implementation in Homework had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, five negative and one positive. It was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness, Initiation Engagement (assessed on two different questions) and Attitude in Task Achievement (Academic). It was correlated positively with Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies.

Ten Child Behavior variables had no significant correlations with any Parent Treatment of Child variables. Only one Parent Treatment of Child variable had no significant correlations.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

One correlation out of six was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated negatively with Child's Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic).

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

There was one significant correlation out of five. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated positively with Child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Child Behavior variables - Tables 64 - 69

As there was no measure of Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression these tables must be excluded from a report on the German data.

Summary

Overall two correlations out of twenty-five were significant, one positive and one negative. Twenty-three Child Behavior variables had no significant correlation with the parent Behavior variable.

Parent Behavior

As only one Parent Behavior variable could be assessed from the German data there were no correlations to be discussed in this area.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

Neither of the two possible correlations were significant.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

The one possible correlation was not significant.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

One correlation out of three was significant. The mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school.

Aggression x Parent Attitude variables - Tables 74 - 76

As there was no measure of mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression these tables must be excluded from a report on the German data.

Summary

One correlation out of a possible six was significant.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Parent Treatment of Child variables - Tables 81 - 84

As there was no measure of mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression these tables must be excluded from a report on the German data.

Summary

There were no significant correlations between the variables in the two areas.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

One out of three possible correlations was significant. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There was one significant correlation out of three. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School.

Summary

Two correlations out of a possible twelve were significant, both of them positive.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

There was one significant correlation out of four. Parental Implementation of Homework was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

There was only one significant correlation out of twenty-eight.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

There was one significant correlation out of four. Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety area.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There were no significant correlations.

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were two significant correlations out of twelve, both of them negative. Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Activity Level Mother-Child Interaction, while Parental Attitude Towards Importance of School was correlated negatively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Five correlations out of fifty-two were significant, four negative and one of them positive. Four out of the Parent Attitude variables had no significant correlations, while six of the Parent Treatment of Child variables had no significant correlations.

ITALY

INTRODUCTION

The parents were chosen by chance within the sample of children of the first stage so that eighty mothers and forty fathers were selected to be interviewed.

For every one of the eight cells we sampled ten more subjects than necessary, in order to substitute those parents who refused to be interviewed. Only in some cases (fifteen) did the interviewers visit the parents at their homes. The majority of the parents were interviewed at the Institute of Psychology after having contacted them by phone and having fixed a date with them.

The parents belonging to the upper class live in the center or near the center of Milan. The parents belonging to the upper-lower class live in the center or in the outlying areas of the city. The types of areas were substantially the same as those from which the schools were chosen. The parents in general were interested in cooperating in the study. Nine fathers and five mothers (twelve percent) refused to be interviewed, saying that they were too busy. It has been observed that mothers were more willing to cooperate and showed a greater interest than fathers did. Mothers knew their children better and gave in general more exhaustive responses not only as far as the achievement of the child at school but also as far as his attitudes and behavior were concerned. In some cases fathers gave the impression of under-evaluating the importance of the needs of their children and showed a rather rigid attitude as far as the educational system they use.

Compared to other studies in which the subjects were contacted by telephone, our initiative has been more successful, since we obtained a higher percentage of cooperators.

For the interview we selected three psychologists belonging to the permanent staff of the project and two of the best assistant psychologists working at the Institute of Psychology of the Medical Faculty of Milan.

The training was divided in two different stages. In the first stage the five interviewers had several meetings in which they discussed the technique of the interview and the goals of the field work.

The second stage regarded a certain number of pilot interviews (five) carried on by each of the interviewers. After that, another meeting was arranged with the principal investigator and the types of responses were analyzed.

Parents' interview method has already been used in our country in scientific psychological studies.

The Programma IARD of Milan, in connection with the Van Leer Foundation (1969), carried out seventy-two interviews with mothers of children who have been previously tested.

The content of these interviews concerned family influence on child behavior with particular reference to the extended and nuclear family structure and to the parent-child relationship. This study is relevant to our research in the sense that it indicates the relationship between the structure of the family and the parent-child interaction on one hand and the capacity of socialization of the child and his level of academic achievement on the other hand. The results of this research are still unpublished.

Another research carried on in Italy which is relevant to our study is that of Migliorini and Peterson (see Child Development, Vol. 38, n. 4, 1967). In this study seventy-one mothers and seventy-one fathers of Palermo (Sicily) and an equal number in Champaign (Illinois) have been interviewed following schedules adapted from those of Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) in order to study the common and the different patterns of behavior of Italian and American parents. The results of this study show that Sicilian parents differ from parents in the United States mainly in the severity of the control they exercise over their children. Furthermore, American permissiveness for aggression toward parental authority, as well as encouragement of aggression toward peers, are substantially greater than in the Sicilian culture.

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

Eighty-three percent of the children in the sample lived with both their parents, thirteen percent of them lived with one parent and a relative, three children lived with a parent and a non-relative. One fourteen-year-old female of the upper-lower class lived with only one parent.

Neither the age nor the sex and the social class of the child showed any significant relationship as far as who took main responsibility for him -- both parents or just mother or father (Mothers alone were responsible for seventy-three percent of the cases: seventy percent for males and seventy-five percent for females).

Only thirty-one percent of the mothers interviewed were born in the Milan area, the number being fairly evenly distributed by age and sex of the children.

In regard to the social class variable, there were forty-five percent of the upper-middle class mothers born in Milan and only eighteen percent of the upper-lower class: this difference was statistically significant at the .02 level.

Twenty-nine percent of mothers had been born in an adjacent community, with more of the upper-lower mothers being born there (thirty-five percent versus twenty-three percent).

Thirty percent of fathers were born in Milan and, as for the mothers, the numbers were fairly evenly distributed for age and sex but not for social class. Forty-five percent of the upper-middle class and fifteen percent of the upper-lower were born in Milan.

Twenty-eight percent of the fathers were born in an adjacent region, twenty-one percent in a different region, fifteen percent in rural areas and six percent in the same region but in a different town.

Neither age nor sex and social class produced significant differences in the distribution of age of mothers. The chronological level most represented was that from thirty-five to thirty-nine years of age which was thirty-eight percent of the total. The forty to forty-four group amounted to twenty-five percent of the total.

As far as the age of fathers was concerned, the thirty-five to thirty-nine group had the highest frequency (thirty-five percent) with the forty to forty-four group the next highest (twenty-six percent). As might be expected the ten-year-olds had younger fathers (thirty-eight percent) than the fourteen-year-olds (fifteen percent).

Eighty-three percent of the mothers in the sample did not have a paid occupation. Among those who worked there were no significant differences on any of the three variables.

The significant results on the question concerning father's occupation were almost exactly what had been expected as careful grading of occupation had been built into the sample selection.

Only eight percent of the mothers had a university degree, and sixteen percent had some college education. All these mothers belonged to the upper-middle class group. The thirty percent of mothers who had been educated only to the end of grade eight were predominantly in the upper-lower class group, only two being upper-middle class mothers.

As far as father's education was concerned, twenty-one percent of them had a university degree and twenty-five percent some college, and all belonged to the upper-middle class. It is to be noted that thirty-five percent of the fathers left school at fourteen years of age, and that three percent of them left school at ten -- all being members of the upper-lower group.

Thirty-nine percent of the sample had lived in their present house for eleven years or more, while a further thirty-five percent had lived in their residence at least five years. So the sample might be regarded as a stable one in terms of geographical mobility; this was supported by the fact that seventy-eight percent of the families had only lived in one, or in no other place since the child sampled had been born. Only six percent had been away from home for six months or more.

Forty-five percent of the children sampled had never been in a hospital and the remainder had only been in on one occasion (thirty-nine percent) or two occasions (sixteen percent). For twenty-nine percent the stay in the hospital had been a week or less and for twenty-six percent the stay had been longer, with four children having been in the hospital for more than a month.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

This series of questions in the interview was aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his manner of tackling academic problems as perceived by the mother.

Forty percent of mothers reported that their child had a strong positive or positive attitude toward school. Only ten percent reported that their child had negative or strong negative feelings. When asked about their child's achievement in general terms, thirty-five percent of mothers reported positive achievement, twenty-one percent both positive and negative aspects, nineteen percent were neutral and thirteen percent reported negatively. When asked about achievement in more specific terms, twenty-three percent saw their child as achieving above average in relation to his age group, while twenty-six percent indicated that their child was below average or unsatisfactory and twenty-four percent reported their children's achievements as basically average.

Only sixteen percent of the mothers interviewed reported that their child tried to avoid doing his homework. The remainder did it either at a regular time (twenty percent) or immediately upon coming home from school (forty-three percent). The same number (forty-three percent) as gave homework high priority are reported as getting on with it without any encouragement, while thirty-five percent needed some reminding. Only five percent needed to be firmly reminded.

Four percent always or frequently put off their homework to do other things. The great majority seldom or never did this. If they made a mistake in their homework, forty-nine percent of the children would spontaneously start again and only five percent would not, while the others would restart the work but unwillingly.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more mothers of ten-year-olds reported that their children had strong positive feelings toward school (twenty-three percent) as compared to only one mother of the fourteen-year-olds.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more upper-lower children's mothers reported that their children had positive feelings about school (forty-three percent) compared to the upper-middle class (thirteen percent).

If, after nearly finishing a task, they found that they had been doing it the wrong way, fewer upper-lower children (three percent) would start again but be unhappy about it as against twenty-three percent of upper-middle class children.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The distribution of responses to the question concerning the child's academic performance would suggest that parents were giving a fairly optimistic report on their children, with half of them seeing their child's performance as above average.

Another remarkable result was that the great majority of Milanese children did not need any pushing from their parents to do their homework. That means that they were conscious of their duties and felt strongly their academic responsibilities.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

Fifty-four percent of mothers reported they would like their child to obtain a university degree, and forty-three percent of mothers thought their children would effectively reach the university degree. Another twenty-nine percent would like their child to have some other tertiary education and thirty percent expected that this would happen.

No mother reported that she would like her child to occupy in the future a job belonging to the lowest socioeconomic levels, and thirty-three percent of the mothers reported they would not put any restrictions on their child's choice, but forty percent would like the job to be in the upper-middle class range.

When asked about the child's own aspiration thirty-three percent thought the choice would be at the upper-middle level but only twenty-six percent expected the child to obtain a job at this level.

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more mothers belonging to the upper-middle class (thirty-nine percent) reported they would like their child to obtain a university degree compared to fifteen percent of mothers belonging to the upper-lower class and thirty-four percent compared to nine percent thought their children would effectively reach a university degree .

Significantly more upper-lower mothers (forty percent versus eighteen percent) would like their child to have some other tertiary education.

Significantly more mothers of the upper-lower class (forty-eight percent compared to thirteen percent) reported they would like their children to occupy a level three position (i.e., a subordinate employee position). At the same time significantly more mothers of the upper-lower class (twenty-eight compared to five percent of upper-middle class mothers) reported that they would not like their child to take up a level three job when he was grown. When asked about the child's own preference more upper-lower mothers (forty percent versus eight percent) felt that the child would choose a level three job and that their child would obtain such a job (forty-three versus eighteen percent). Finally, significantly more mothers of the upper-middle class (forty-eight percent versus twenty percent of upper-middle mothers) reported they did not know what future job their children would choose.

3. Sex

Mothers would like boys to occupy higher professional positions more than they would girls (forty-three percent versus thirteen percent) while girls were preferred to boys in a position such as high school teacher (twenty three percent versus three percent).

Mothers felt that their boys would like to occupy higher occupational status more than their girls (thirty-three percent versus ten percent), but that girls would more often like to have level two jobs (thirty-five percent versus five percent) and level three jobs (forty versus eighteen percent).

c. Summary and Interpretation

More than half of the mothers showed a very high educational aspiration level for the future studies of their children.

This result was confirmed by the conviction about the academic success of children. This optimistic perspective was partly linked to the deep reformations of the Italian school system which apparently is likely to facilitate the academic careers of the children.

One-third of the mothers reported they would not put any restriction on the educational aspiration of their children. This consideration seemed to be strongly supported by the higher economic opportunities (if compared to the facts) the families now possess, more than by a more permissive attitude toward children's aspirations.

Mothers tended to facilitate the male perspective on occupational careers.

This kind of data is probably linked to the traditional oversight of the destination of the sex roles,.which still persists even if to a lesser extent when compared with the past.

Many mothers of the upper-lower class would like to see their children occupy an employee position which means more security, rather than more advancement through the socioeconomic scale.

III. Nonacademic Activities

The number of activities reported ranged from zero to five or more, with two and three being most frequent (thirty-three percent and twenty-six percent respectively).

Twenty-one percent of mothers reported that they spent part of their time with their children in constructive activities, ten percent in verbal activities, while the remainder answered expressing positive or negative affect (respectively eighteen percent and twenty percent) or in a neutral way. The most frequent activities of mother and child together concerned household activities (thirty-four percent); twenty percent participated in indoor activities including homework while twenty-four percent of mothers reported no interaction.

Thirty-four percent of mothers reported that their husbands spent part of their time with the children in constructive activities, twenty-three percent in verbal activities, while the remainder answered expressing negative affect or lack of interaction (thirty-three percent) or responded in a neutral way (nineteen percent). The most frequent activities engaged in by the father and child together were conversation, and churchgoing or other outings (both sixteen percent).

These two together equal the number reported as doing nothing together (thirty-three percent).

When family activities are reported on, the most frequent (twenty-five percent) are indoor activities, then outings (eighteen percent), household activities and television or listening to music, both thirteen percent. In sixteen percent of the cases no family activities are reported.

Fifty-eight percent of the children in the sample did not belong to any clubs, organizations or groups. Those who socialized in such a formal way mainly belonged to organized groups (thirty percent).

Also, fifty-eight percent of the children did not have any hobbies, lessons or classes, eighteen percent had cultural activities (music, art), and fourteen percent had intellectual recreation.

Eighty-nine percent of mothers reported that their children had no jobs or chores around the house.

With so few children having to carry out chores or jobs around the house, the tables do not merit discussion. However, when the question dealt with whether children helped around the house without being asked, sixty-four percent reported that their children helped always, frequently or sometimes, while only eighteen percent indicated that they never received spontaneous help.

1. Age

There were no significant differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences in this area.

3. Sex

Significantly more females (thirty-five percent versus eight percent) engaged in constructive activities with their mothers. As expected, females were much more frequently engaged in household activities than males (forty-five percent versus five percent), while males more often engaged in indoor activities including homework (thirty-three percent versus eight percent). Fewer boys were nonactive than girls (eight percent versus thirty percent).

Significantly more males (twenty-eight percent versus eight percent) went out with the family to visit museums, attend sporting events, or to watch movies.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The great amount of children who did not socialize in a formal way (clubs, groups, organizations) would probably mean that there is a sort of resistance toward these modern and more structured forms of socialization (one of the stereotypes is "fair or bad company"). In fact, this kind of result leads us to believe that it would be useful to carry on a particular study in this area.

Females seemed to be strictly engaged with household activities and profited less than males from outgoing activities. The interpretation of this data reconfirms the traditional attitude toward the destination of the social role of the sexes.

IV. Authority

Twenty-five percent of mothers reported that their children accepted positively their intervention when they were doing a job in the wrong way. The same proportion of mothers stated a negative acceptance of their intervention by the child.

Twenty-five percent of mothers stated that their children accepted positively, apologized or rationalized verbally their discipline or punishment, and forty-four percent of them reacted in a negatively emotional or hostile way. These percentages were respectively twenty-four percent and thirty-nine percent when the father disciplined the children.

To criticism by mothers, twenty-nine percent of children reacted with positive acceptance. Twenty-eight percent reacted in different ways according to the occasion, twenty-two reacted in an aggressive manner, while nine percent sulked or withdrew.

To criticism by fathers, twenty-five percent of children reacted with positive acceptance. Twenty-one percent cried or felt hurt, fourteen percent remained quiet. The other forms of reactions ranged in frequency from eleven percent to five percent.

Age

There were no significant age differences in this area.

Class

There were no significant class differences in this area.

Sex

Significantly more females (fifty-five percent versus fifty-nine percent for males) accepted or apologized when criticized by their mothers. The same response occurred when the criticism was from the father (forty percent versus nineteen percent). When the mother criticized more boys than girls reacted differently according to the situation (forty-eight percent versus eight percent).

Summary and Interpretations

There were no consistent differences in the children's reactions to the intervention of the mother and of the father. One must doubt somewhat the sincerity of the substantial percentage of mothers who reported that their children accepted positively the discipline or the punishments.

In other words, it appears that some of the questions of this area were somewhat too delicate and it cannot be determined if the responses given are available or not.

Females seemed to be more compliant to criticism, perhaps because less frustrated at parents' expectation for them is not so high as that for the males.

V. Jobs outside the Home

None of the children in the sample had a regular job or worked outside the home.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

Only five percent of the children reacted in a positive way when criticized by brothers and sisters or other children; four percent did not react at all, thirty-five had a mild reaction, twenty-six percent had a strong reaction, while six percent withdrew or reacted defensively. Only five percent were not criticized by siblings.

Forty-five percent of the mothers reported that their children got along very well with other children, while fourteen percent reported that their children got along poorly with other children.

As far as children's behavior in interaction with peers was concerned, sixteen percent of the children were described as bossy, dominating, having a temper, eighteen percent as shy or being a follower, thirty-eight as gregarious, and three percent as independent. Eleven percent are described as having very few or no friends.

Fifty-six percent of mothers reported that friends had no influence on their child's behavior, eight percent reported that they had a good influence, and six percent that they had a bad influence. An influence was recognized but considered to be neither good nor bad by nineteen percent of mothers.

Forty-nine percent of children expressed hostile affect when someone hurt their feelings, sixteen percent expressed negative depressed affect, six percent ignored or withdrew, while the remainder expressed other kinds of reactions.

Age

Significantly more fourteen-year-old children (thirty-eight percent) reacted in a strong way when criticized by brothers and sisters or by other children (as compared to fifteen percent of the ten-year-old children).

Class

Significantly more upper-middle children (twenty-eight percent as compared to five percent of the upper-lower class) were described by the mothers as bossy or dominant.

Sex

Significantly more females (fifty-eight percent) were described as getting along very well with other children as compared to the males (thirty-three percent).

Summary and Interpretation

When criticized by brothers or other children, boys and girls reacted in different ways.

On the basis of the reports of mothers, it seems that the personality of a great number of children was oriented toward independence. Milanese children seemed to be also sensitive when their feelings were hurt.

Females were better oriented toward socialization with peers. This better interpersonal relations with other childrenwas probably linked to a minor aggressivity, i.e., to a minor frustration experienced within the family.

VII. Anxiety

Fifty-eight percent of mothers reported that their children got depressed, lost their control or expressed hostile affect when they got worried; fifteen percent talked with someone, twenty-three percent withdrew from the situation, five percent initiated some goal-directed action and six percent tried to remain calm. Only five percent never worried.

In sixty-nine percent of the cases the reasons for becoming worried were given as academic problems, and only in a few cases were the reasons reported to be family problems (self-concern, six percent, death, war, eight percent).

Forty-three percent of the mothers reported that their children did not turn to others for help when they got worried, thirty percent turned to the mother, only eight percent to the father, and fourteen percent to others.

There were no age, sex or class differences in this area.

Summary and Interpretation

Very few children initiated goal-directed actions upon becoming worried. This result suggests that, even for the older children, emotionality is hard to control and direct.

Reasons for worrying in sixty-nine percent of the cases linked to academic problems. This result confirmed the fact that the children were afraid of parents' reactions toward their academic behavior. The parents' expectation was undoubtedly too high and the attitudes were likely to be punitive in an exaggerated way.

If worried, Milanese children tended to turn mainly to the mother, the parental figure who is perceived as more sensitive to youth problems and psychologically less distant.

VIII. Aggression

Forty-nine percent of the children in the sample became angry because of minor grievances, thirteen because of major grievances and sixteen percent because their behavior was controlled by parents or because they were punished by them. Eight percent were reported as being annoyed with themselves.

When angry, twenty-three percent of the children expressed verbal hostility, thirteen percent used physical aggression, eleven percent became depressed, eleven percent expressed hostile affect, eleven percent withdrew, and five percent controlled the anger or coped actively with it.

When angry at mother, twenty-one percent of children controlled their emotionality or accepted the blame, nine percent expressed depressive feelings, ten percent expressed hostile reactions, four percent withdrew, nineteen percent did nothing or did not express any kind of emotionality, while eighteen percent expressed verbal aggression.

When angry at father, nine percent of children controlled their emotionality or accepted the blame, five percent expressed depressive feelings, six percent expressed hostile reactions, six percent verbal aggression, and twenty-four percent did nothing or did not express any kind of emotionality.

When a friend had been angry with him, only eleven percent of the mothers reported that their children reinstated the friendship or accepted the situation, while ten percent expressed hostile emotionality, eighteen percent had no reaction, eleven had depressive reactions. Thirteen percent denied that their children ever got angry with a friend.

The overall distribution of responses by age is significant: more of the fourteen-year-olds (twenty-five percent versus one percent) showing no reaction when angry with a friend and more ten-year-olds becoming depressed.

Summary and Interpretation

It is important to point out how neither sex nor class differentiated quantitatively the modalities of expression of aggressive behavior. There was a major control of the emotionality only when children were angry at the mother. This major control could be interpreted in the light of a major fear as well as in the light of a major consideration of the sex of the mother.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

Forty-three percent of the mothers indicated satisfaction with the school achievement of their children, twenty-three dissatisfaction, and thirty-five percent indicated neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction.

Only ten percent of the mothers reported that they had never met their child's teacher; fifty-eight percent indicated that the meeting with the teacher occurred on their own initiative, while for fourteen percent the meeting had been school-initiated.

Twenty-four percent of the mothers said that they did nothing to encourage their child in his schoolwork, while the same percentage reported unspecified help or assistance with homework only. Thirty-six percent adopted encouraging attitudes and thirteen percent provided direct support, including educational materials.

Two-thirds (sixty-six percent) of mothers reported they checked or observed their children in order to see they got their homework done and six percent used a verbal reminder. For twenty percent external (school) pressures were sufficient.

In the opinion of mothers, the school's job or responsibility concerned overall school subjects or teaching culture (eight percent), educating (thirty-one percent), preparation for life and job (fifteen percent), instilling values, character building and guidance being mentioned by twenty-five percent.

Eighty-three percent of the mothers thought the school was most or very important and none of them thought it was unimportant.

Thirty-four percent of the mothers thought the school important for personal and social development, twenty percent for socioeconomic (job) reasons, and thirty-one percent as a preparation for life.

Age

Significantly more mothers of ten-year-olds (seventy-five percent) met their child's teacher because of her own initiative, as compared to forty percent of mothers of fourteen-year-old children.

More mothers of fourteen-year-olds (fifty-six percent) were dissatisfied with their child's progress than were mothers of ten-year-olds (ten percent).

Class

Significantly more mothers of upper-middle class children (forty percent) encouraged their children in their schoolwork by homework encouragement only as compared to eight percent of the upper-lower mothers.

Significantly more mothers of upper-middle class (forty-five percent compared to eighteen percent) saw the school's job or responsibility as educating the child.

Sex

Significantly more mothers did nothing to encourage their daughters (thirty-five percent) in their homework as compared to fifteen percent for the sons.

Summary and Interpretations

The initiative of mothers for meeting their child's teacher seemed too small after elementary school. This tendency was interpreted as a negative behavior and as a weak sense of responsibility.

It is important to note that more than twenty percent indicated dissatisfaction with the school achievement of their child. This percentage, of course, cannot be taken as an indication of insufficient achievement at school.

The Milanese child was in most cases observed and checked by his mother who determines whether or not he does the homework. This attitude, which is generalized through both social classes, does not facilitate either the independence of the child or his sense of responsibility.

Children belonging to the upper-middle class are more encouraged in their schoolwork. This kind of result was expected.

Females needed less pushing than males for doing their homework and this was due to a greater autonomy and maturity on the part of the girls.

II. Authority

Sixty-nine percent of the mothers reported that when they wanted to get their child to do something, they requested it mildly and sixteen requested it strongly. Ten percent just presented the task or gave a rational explanation, while only five percent ordered or demanded.

Thirty-eight percent of the mothers said that no follow-up was needed to see that their child did what she wanted him to do, twenty-eight percent reminded or explained to the child, and nineteen rewarded or punished the child. Six percent of the answers mentioned emotional appeal of some kind.

If the mothers saw that their child was not doing a job the right way, fifty-nine percent of them demonstrated it to him, twenty-five percent scolded him, and ten percent made the child maintain the standard of his performance.

When asked how they disciplined their child, thirty-six percent of mothers reported using mild verbal means, while nineteen percent used strong verbal methods. Fifteen percent deprived the child of privileges and thirteen percent used physical punishment.

Types of discipline used by fathers were fairly similar to those used by mothers. Thirty-eight percent of fathers used mild verbal means and twenty-three percent strong verbal. However, only six percent deprived the child of privileges, while nine percent used physical punishment.

Mothers reported that twenty percent of fathers never disciplined their child. Only eight percent of mothers came in this category.

There were no significant age or class differences, but there was one significant sex difference. Strong verbal methods of punishment were used more often by mothers of boys (twenty-eight percent) than by mothers of girls (thirteen percent).

Summary and Interpretation

It seems particularly significant that one of every five mothers stated that she scolded her child in order to make him do what she wanted. In reality, this rate was probably higher and this attitude reveals a certain lack of education of mothers in educating their children.

III. Interpersonal Relations

Forty-six percent of mothers reported that they did nothing to help their child get along with other children, twenty-four percent trained them or prepared them for a positive approach, fourteen percent trained them for a negative approach, and eight percent encouraged social activities.

Age

Significantly more ten-year-old children (thirty-five percent compared to thirteen percent of fourteen-year-olds) were trained positively.

Class

Significantly more upper-middle class mothers (sixty percent) reported that they did nothing to help their child get along with other children compared to thirty-three percent of the upper-lower class mothers.

There was no sex difference in this area.

Summary and Interpretation

Almost half of the mothers in the sample stated that they did nothing for direct socialization of their child with his peers. This result indicated how few considerations the parents have still toward the socialization process. If one adds to this figure the training for a negative approach, it must be realized that the families which have a rational and well balanced opinion of the importance of the interpersonal relations of their children were rather few.

It was certainly unexpected that upper-middle mothers did "nothing" in this sense to a greater extent than did upper-lower mothers.

This result could be interpreted also in the sense that the response "nothing" for upper-middle mothers could often have meant "I do not need to do anything."

IV. Anxiety

To the question "What do you usually advise your child to do when he is worried?" fifty-eight percent of the mothers in the sample reported that they reassured him, advised religious solace or tried to reduce their tension, twenty-one percent encouraged their children to engage in direct action toward the source of worry and six percent did nothing.

There were neither age, sex, nor class differences in this area.

Summary and Interpretation

Only one mother in every five showed rational behavior in order to help her child understand the reasons for his worry. This low rate is probably explained by the fact that often, in Italy, parents tend to give very small importance to the child's behavior which they can manage with some predominant behavior (in this case reassurance) which has as a goal not the intellectual and emotional development of the child but his own personal peace of mind.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

Seventy-five percent of the mothers in the sample had not taken any courses or training after the school years, fifteen had taken professional or intellectual courses, and five percent had taken domestic courses.

Personal satisfaction was the principal reason for having taken any kind of course (eleven percent).

Among those mothers who had taken courses, about ninety percent did so shortly after school (twenty-four percent of sample).

Eighteen percent of the mothers reported that they had completed the courses.

Sixteen percent of the mothers said that they felt that they had gained from these courses or training.

Age

Significantly more mothers of fourteen-year-old children (eighty-five percent) had not taken any courses or training after school, as compared to (sixty percent) the mothers of the ten-year-olds.

Class

Significantly more mothers of upper-lower class children (ninety-three percent) had not taken any courses or training after the school years, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the upper-middle class mothers. More of the upper-middle mothers completed the classes (twenty-eight percent versus eight percent).

There were no sex differences in this area.

Summary and Interpretation

The figures indicated that, after school, formal education was rather poor, considering that they lived in the biggest industrial city of Italy. The age difference indicated, on the other hand, that the situation is starting to change, even if slowly.

II. Occupational Aspects

Among those mothers who did work (fifteen percent of the total mothers in the sample), one-fourth reported they were in that kind of work for convenience, one-fourth for family trade or financial returns, and only one-sixth for external factors. All of the mothers who worked talked about their work in a descriptive way.

More than half of mothers who did work (seven of twelve) expressed positive affect toward their work and only two expressed negative affect.

To the question "Would you choose the same kind of work if you had it to do over?" only one-third of the mothers who did work answered "yes."

More than half of the mothers who did work (seven of twelve) reported that they preferred to solve by themselves the problems which came up involving their work.

There were no significant differences by age, sex or class in this area.

Summary and Interpretation

The percentage of mothers who did work was very low, less than the national average, which is at present between twenty and twenty-eight percent. This very restricted number of working mothers (twelve) did not allow us to extrapolate interpretations or hypotheses.

III. Personal Characteristics

When criticized, mothers reported that they react in the following manners:

	In general %	By husband %	By friends %	By their child %
Rationalizing	31	24	26	18
Taking it well	4	3	3	6
Ignoring	19	9	13	4
Dislikes, takes poorly	25	16	18	11
Defensive verbal or becoming angry	15	32	10	15
Other ways	1	8	21	28
Does not happen	5	9	9	18
TOTAL PERCENT	100	100	100	100

To the question "What kinds of things make you angry?" thirty-one percent of the mothers reported that the source of anger was the child, eighteen percent reported annoying behavior of other people, sixteen percent some petty annoyance, and fifteen percent some strong annoyance or un-just accusation.

When angry, fifty-five percent of the mothers reported that they reacted physically or verbally, eight percent expressed hostile affect of experienced physiological reactions, eleven controlled the anger, and nine percent withdrew.

Age

Significantly more mothers of fourteen-year-old children (twenty-three percent) reported they got angry when criticized by their husband than did the mothers of ten-year-old children (ten percent).

Class

Significantly more upper-middle mothers (forty-eight percent) reported that they reacted by analyzing the situation rationally when criticized in general as compared to fifteen percent of the upper-lower mothers.

Sex

More mothers of boys than girls reported taking badly criticism by friends (twenty-eight percent versus eight percent).

Summary and Interpretation

When criticized by their children, roughly half of the mothers in the sample reported that they reacted in a negative emotional manner. Mothers stood sufficiently criticisms from the husband, but they seemed to be more sensitive to the criticisms of friends.

It was also noted that almost a third of the mothers indicated the child as a source of anger.

These two different results outlined how the relationship between mothers and children were sometimes very tense and irrational. This seems to be particularly true for the upper-lower class mothers who had less power to analyze rationally the situations.

In short, it appeared evident that emotionality played a large role in the relationship between mothers and children at the two age levels considered in the present study.

IV. Occupational Values

The following is the rank order for the preferences expressed by mothers for their children between the fifteen values presented.

Doing the job well, helping others, having a stable job and doing interesting things were the most favored aspects mothers found in the list of values presented to them.

Age

There were no age differences in this area.

Class

Significantly more upper-lower mothers (fourteen percent) chose as their favorite value (first place) "to have a stable job" as compared to only one percent of upper-middle mothers.

Sex

Significantly more mothers of males (eleven percent) chose as the favorite job (first place) "to become famous" as compared to only three of the mothers of females.

Summary and Interpretation

As was expected, security on the job was very important for lower class mothers.

The majority of mothers chose as first "doing well at his job" because this probably involves also other aspects as "make a career," "money," and "to manage other people."

Rank of items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Percent giving that rank to the items															
Intellectual Stimulation	13	19	8	14	5	5	5	9	9	4	4	→		5	
Variety	3	4	11	6	5	5	5	9	5	8	11	→		26	
Surroundings	5	1	8	15	18	11	10	11	5	3	3	→		10	
Creativity	3	5	6	1	6	3	10	3	6	13	11	→		35	
Follow job of Father	0	0	5	1	1	1	3	1	10	6	6	→		66	
Security	15	9	10	5	9	1	6	8	9	10	4	→		14	
Altruism	18	13	9	11	8	10	11	8	1	4	→			7	
Manage other people	3	3	5	5	5	6	4	6	8	8	14	→		33	
Esthetic (artistic)	5	3	1	0	0	3	5	9	3	6	9	→		58	
Economic Returns	4	13	11	3	5	6	4	5	10	5	9	→		25	
Success	-	5	5	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	→		-	
Independence	5	4	5	6	6	8	8	6	8	5	15	→		24	
Prestige	4	1	4	3	3	5	4	3	9	14	9	→		41	
Associates	1	9	6	9	18	16	15	6	6	3	1	→		10	
Self-Satisfaction	19	11	6	10	8	15	5	9	5	3	3	→		6	

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Nine correlations out of a possible thirty-six were significant, three positive and six negative. Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness (Nonacademic) and negatively with Implementation in the same area. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated positively with Activity Level defined as number of organized groups belonged to and with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), and negatively with Coping Effectiveness (Nonacademic). Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) as it related to the question on homework correlated positively with Initiation and negatively with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

One correlation out of thirty was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

One correlation was significant out of eighteen. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

One correlation out of twelve was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

Three correlations out of twenty-four were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in Coping Effectiveness (Academic) were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Eleven correlations out of thirty were significant, four positive and seven negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and negatively when criticized by both father and mother. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and father and when criticized by mother and positively when criticized by the father. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother, positively when disciplined by the father and negatively when criticized by the mother. Initiation in doing jobs around the house was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

Six correlations out of eighteen were significant, two of them positive and four negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by another child. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively, both with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along with other children, and Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

Five correlations out of twelve were significant, four positive and one negative. Activity Level defined as number of hobbies and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic)were correlated positively and Implementation correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area. Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) both were correlated positively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Eight correlations out of twenty-four were significant, five positive and three negative. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping

Effectiveness when angry with the mother and with friends. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with father and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

One correlation out of fifteen was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

One correlation out of ten was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety situation.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Three correlations out of twenty were significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by both father and mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

Two correlations out of six were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated positively and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

One correlation out of twelve was significant. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Aggression in general.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Summary

Overall fifty-four out of two hundred seventy-five correlations were significant, twenty-three negative and thirty-one positive.

Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) had the most significant correlations with other variables. It was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness, Initiation, Engagement and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), negatively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and when criticized by the mother, and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children. It was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father and Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children. It was also correlated positively with Implementation in the Anxiety area and with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with the father and with friends.

Only one variable had no significant correlations with any other variable. This was Attitude Toward Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

There were two significant correlations out of eighteen. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated perfectly with parental satisfaction at child's Academic Task Achievement, the correlation value being 1.00. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) also was correlated positively with parental satisfaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

There were seven significant correlations out of eighteen, five negative and two positive. Activity level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) all were correlated negatively with Parental Satisfaction in Child's Academic Task Achievement. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated positively and Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and negatively with Parental Initiation in contacting school, while Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Initiation in

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

There were seven significant correlations out of eighteen, three negative and four positive. Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, a high score emphasizing Task Achievement functions. Initiation, Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated positively with this variable. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School, while Implementation was correlated negatively and Coping Effectiveness was correlated positively with the second measure of Parental Conception of the Major Function of School.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

There were four significant correlations out of ten, one negative and three positive. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father and by the mother both were correlated positively with Parental Satisfaction over Child's Academic Task Achievement, while Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Authority x School - Table 24

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

There was one significant correlation out of nine. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children was correlated positively with Parental Satisfaction over Child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

There was one significant correlation out of six. Implementation in Anxiety was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 33

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, twenty-four out of two hundred eight correlations were significant, thirteen negative and eleven positive. Parental satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement had the greatest number of significant correlations with other variables, eight in all, three negative and five positive. It was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and by the father and Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children. It was correlated negatively with Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, and with Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Thirteen Child Behavior variables and one Parent Attitude variable had no significant correlations.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Attitude Toward Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

Two correlations were significant out of six, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively and Initiation in the same area was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in an Anxiety situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There were four significant correlations out of twelve, three positive and one negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork and positively with Parental Implementation of Homework. Implementation was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork while Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

Three correlations were significant out of twelve, one positive and two negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in the same area. Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Fourteen correlations out of thirty were significant, ten negative and four positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Activity Level Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions, negatively with Positive Affect Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions,and negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Activity Level Mother-Child Interaction, negatively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction and positively with Degree of Guidance given by parents. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Activity Level Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions, positively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction and negatively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction, and with Degree of Guidance given by Parents. Initiation in the homework area was correlated positively with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

Three of the six correlations were significant. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated positively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety area.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

There was one significant correlation out of twenty-five. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There was one significant correlation out of six. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child was correlated positively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

There was one significant correlation out of six. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

There were four significant correlations out of fifteen. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children was correlated positively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction and with Positive Affect Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions and negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

One correlation out of three was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in an Anxiety situation.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

Two correlations out of ten were significant, both positive. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated with Activity Level and Positive Affect Fater-Child Interaction.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

One correlation out of eight was significant. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Thirty-nine correlations out of two hundred fifty-nine were significant, nineteen negative and twenty positive.

Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area had the greatest number of significant correlations with other variables. It was correlated positively with Parental Implementation in Homework, with Degree of Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction and with Degree of Parental Guidance in Anxiety. It was correlated negatively with Degree of Parental Guidance in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), with Activity Level Mother-Child and Father-Child Interaction, with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction and with Degree of Guidance by Parents in the Interpersonal Relations area.

Twelve variables had no significant correlations with other variables. All were in the Child Behavior area.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - ~~Table~~ 58

There were four significant correlations out of twenty-four, all of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband and when criticized by friends both were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was also correlated positively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic), while Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated positively with Child's Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic).

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

There were four significant correlations out of twenty-four, three positive and one negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated positively with Child's Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Mother's Coping Effectiveness with friends' criticism was correlated positively with Child's Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), while Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated negatively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic).

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

There were three significant correlations out of twenty, all of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated with Child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined and when criticized by the father. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated positively with Child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There was one significant correlation out of six. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, thirteen out of one hundred thirty correlations were significant, one negative and twelve positive.

Three variables had four significant correlations with other variables. They were Child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband and when criticized by friends.

Eighteen Child Behavior variables had no significant correlations but all the Parent Behavior variables were correlated with at least one Child Behavior variable.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There was one significant correlation out of four. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her friends was correlated positively with Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There were two significant correlations out of twelve. Coping Effectiveness with criticism and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children were correlated positively with parental satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

Two out of twelve correlations were significant, both of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, a high score placing emphasis on Academic Task Achievement. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, five out of forty correlations were significant, one of them negative and four of them positive. Four Parent Attitude variables and two Parent Behavior variables had no significant correlations with other variables.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

There were two significant correlations, both of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism and when criticized by friends were correlated with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

There was one significant correlation out of twenty. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Three out of fifty correlations were significant, all of them positive. Eight Parent Treatment of Child variables and two Parent Behavior variables had no significant correlations. One of these was Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area, which was correlated with no Parent Treatment of Child variables.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

There was one significant correlation out of six. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

There was one significant correlation out of nine. Parent's Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Parental Attitude Toward Importance of School.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Two correlations out of twenty-one were significant, both of them positive.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

There were no significant correlations between the variables in the two areas under discussion.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There were two significant correlations out of six. Parent's Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework. Parental Initiation in Contacting School was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

Two correlations out of a possible fifteen were significant. Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively both with Activity Level and Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

Three correlations out of ten were significant, all of them positive. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated with Activity Level Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions and Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There was one significant correlation out of six. Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, a high score placing stress on Task Achievement (Academic) functions, was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There were two significant correlations out of six, both of them negative. Both Parental Attitude Toward Importance of school and Parental Conception of the Major Function of School were correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation.

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were no significant correlations.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Ten correlations out of eighty were significant, two of them negative and eight of them positive. The variables had three significant correlations with other variables. They were Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement and Parental Occupational Aspiration. Two Parent Attitude variables and four Parent Treatment of Child variables had no significant correlations with any other variables.

INTERPRETATIVE COMMENTS

Child Behavior

The significant correlations found in this section gave evidence to the fact that, in the opinion of the parents, children who cared most for nonacademic activities were less motivated in their academic activities and were more independent from the mother figure and from peers. On the other hand, they seemed to be more close to the fathers' norms and to socialize with other children. Furthermore, those children were more consistent in problematic situations in which Anxiety or Aggression was involved.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

The relatively few significant correlations found in this section emphasized the importance given by parents to the academic achievement standing of the child. The importance given to this behavior area was counterbalanced by the fact of neglecting the activity level of the child, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, probably for the fear that the child would perform less effectively in school.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

The significant correlations found in this area indicated that the efficiency of the child in his nonacademic behavior was strictly linked to the parental assistance in homework and directedness and to an adequate relation with the mother figure.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

The few correlations found in this area showed that children succeed better in their nonacademic activities if they were self-initiators, i.e., if they could act independently.

Mothers, in order to act efficiently, seemed to need a push represented by the criticisms of husband and friends.

Parent Behavior

The fact that Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her friends was positively correlated with Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression could mean that in some occasions mothers tended to identify criticism situations with aggression situations.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

The few significant correlations found in this area indicated that parents who think that school has a major function emphasized the importance of academic task achievement of their children. Those parents were also those who coped more efficiently when criticized by children.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

The correlations found in this section showed that Coping Effectiveness is a dimension which tended to be present in various areas of behavior of the parents and the degree was linked to the adequate guidance of the child.

Parent Attitude

Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated with Parental Academic Aspiration. This finding indicated again the importance given by parents to school academic standing in relation to success in the future professional life of the child.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Significant differences found in this area confirmed some of the findings mentioned above.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Description of the Sample

The sample of the parents interviewed was composed of one hundred twenty subjects: eighty mothers and forty fathers.

The eighty mothers were representatives of the eight subgroups considered, ten mothers coming from each socioeconomic group.

The forty fathers were also representative of the eight groups (five per cell).

Child Relevant Items

This series of questions in the interview was aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his manner of attacking academic problems as perceived by the mothers and by the fathers.

I. Academic Task Achievement

No significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses for any of the seven items of this section.

Summary and Interpretation

Mothers and fathers did not disagree on the evaluation of their child's academic standing. This finding should be interpreted in the light of a substantial objectiveness which seems to characterize the parents' perception as far as their child's academic achievement and standing are concerned.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

There was only one significant difference between mothers' and fathers' responses for this section (six items).

The difference concerned the question "What type of job or occupation would you not like to see your child take up when he is grown?" Fifteen mothers compared to only one father mentioned specific occupations such as secretary, midwife, etcetera.

Summary and Interpretation

As far as indicating types of job or occupation they would not like for their children, mothers seem to have, on one hand, clearer ideas than fathers. On the other hand, this finding could be interpreted as a more stereotyped attitude in the mind of the mothers for certain occupations which perhaps, in their opinion, were not good enough for their children.

III. Nonacademic Activities

There was only one significant difference between mothers' and fathers' responses for this section (twelve items).

The difference concerned the question "What kind of things does your child do with you?"

More fathers (thirty-five percent compared to fifteen percent of mothers) indicated church and outings.

Summary and Interpretation

The general lack of differences between mothers' and fathers' perceptions of their child's nonacademic activities indicated that parents were in every occasion very well informed about their children's activities in the nonacademic area.

The greater frequency with which fathers mentioned the weekly visit to church, and outings in general, was due to the fact that fathers have more free time at the week-end, probably.

IV. Authority

In this section (five items), two of the three significant differences which have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses concerned the question "How does your child react toward your intervention when you realize that he is not doing a job the right way?" More fathers (fifty-five percent) than mothers (twenty-five percent) answered indicating the child shows a positive acceptance.

The further significant difference concerned the item "What does your child do in response to punishment by the mother?"

A greater number of fathers (thirty-five percent compared to fifteen percent of mothers) indicated sulking and withdrawal by the child.

Summary and Interpretation

Compared to mothers, fathers showed a more optimistic interpretation of the reaction of their child when he was punished.

This finding indicated that children tended to accept more positively the disciplinary interventions of fathers which, generally speaking, were more rare but perhaps more consistent than the mothers' interventions. Mothers were more vague in this area and seemed to be unsure of the type of reaction by their child.

At the same time, the fathers may react more strongly to negative response by a child, for they reported, much more often than the mothers, children's sulking about being disciplined by the mother.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

None of the children in the sample had a regular job or worked outside home.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

No significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses in this area (four items).

Summary and Interpretation

The lack of significant differences between mothers' and fathers' perception of the interpersonal relations of their children could be interpreted not only as an indication of equal or similar perceptions of their child's behavior in the interpersonal relations area but also as ignorance or as superficiality of the analytical capacities of the parents with regard to their children's interpersonal behavior with other children.

VII. Anxiety

No significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses in this area (three items).

Summary and Interpretation

The same interpretation could be made here as for the interpersonal relations section.

VIII. Aggression

No significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses in this area (five items).

Parent Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

Five significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses in this area (seven items). The first significant difference concerned the amount of satisfaction expressed by the parents at the child's academic task achievement. A greater number of mothers (thirty-five percent compared to fifteen percent of fathers) gave no direct indication of satisfaction or lack of it.

The second significant difference regarded the question "Do you do anything to encourage your child in his schoolwork?" A greater percentage of fathers (forty-four percent as compared to twenty-four percent of mothers) answered "No."

Two further significant differences concerned the items "Have you met your child's teacher? How did you meet?" A greater number of fathers (forty-six percent compared to ten percent of mothers) answered "No."

A greater number of mothers (fifty-eight percent compared to thirty-three percent of fathers) indicated that the meeting took place but did not specify who initiated it.

The last significant difference of this section concerned the question "Why?" linked to the previous one "How important do you think school is?" A greater number of fathers (fifty-six percent compared to thirty-four percent of mothers) indicated personal and social development as a reason.

Summary and Interpretation

Fathers tended to evaluate the academic achievement and behavior of their children with more specificity and assurance than did mothers. Fathers seemed less interested than mothers in contacting teachers in an informal way. Fathers perceived the school's responsibility in the light of personal and social development of the child more than mothers did.

The overall picture we have for this section shows a greater interest shown by mothers toward their children's school life. These mothers wanted to present their children as autonomous and independent young people who did not need encouragement and who felt the responsibility for their schoolwork.

Our experience tells us that this viewpoint is a little forced and does not correspond to the reality of the facts in many situations.

II. Authority

There was only one significant difference between mothers' and fathers' responses for this section (three items).

To the question "What follow-up is needed to see that your child does it?" linked to the previous question "When you want your child to do something, how do you go about getting him to do it?" a major number number of mothers (nineteen percent compared to three percent of fathers) indicated that they administered rewards or punishments.

Summary and Interpretation

The significant difference mentioned above could be interpreted in two different ways. On the one hand, we could hypothesize that the disciplinary intervention of fathers is stronger than that of mothers, i.e., that fathers were more punitive than mothers.

On the other hand, we could also take into account the possibility of a real sincerity verbalized by fathers compared to that of the mothers. It would be hard to say which one of these interpretations is closer to reality.

III. Interpersonal Relations

No significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses for this section (one item).

Summary and Interpretation

Parents had the same attitude when it was a question of helping their child get along with other children.

IV. Anxiety

No significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses for this section (one item).

Summary and Interpretation

Parents had the same attitude when it was a question of advising their child when he was worried.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

There was one significant difference between mothers' and fathers' responses for this section (five items). To the question "Have you taken any courses or training since you left school?" a greater number of fathers (thirty-three percent compared to eleven percent of mothers) answered indicating that they had attended professional and intellectual courses.

Summary and Interpretation

For interpreting this finding, one must take into account the situation of the social roles of the sexes in our country ten to twenty years ago. There were a small number of women who worked and, consequently, there were a small number of professional courses for women. Intellectual activity was reserved mostly for men. It is perhaps needless to say that things have changed a lot since then.

II. Occupational Aspects

In Italy, all thirty-nine fathers and thirteen of the eighty mothers worked.

When asked how they came to be in that kind of work, seven percent of mothers and forty-one percent of fathers said that they wanted that type of work. Falling into the rare response category were ninety-three percent of the mothers' responses and fifty-nine percent of fathers' responses.

When asked what their job was like, eighty-five percent of mothers and ninety-seven percent of fathers gave purely descriptive responses. When asked how they felt about their job, fifty percent of mothers and fifty-one percent of fathers indicated positive affect. Neutral or ambivalent responses were given by twenty-one percent of mothers and thirty-three percent of fathers.

When asked what they liked about their jobs, the only category with sufficient frequencies of responses was the combined rare response category. Seventy-one percent of mothers' and ninety-four percent of fathers' responses were classified in this category. When asked what they disliked about their job, again only the rare response category had sufficient frequency of responses. Seventy-one percent of the mothers' responses and ninety-four percent of fathers' responses fell in this category.

When asked if they would choose the same kind of work if they had it to do over again, fifty percent of mothers and fifty-one percent of fathers said no. Twenty-eight percent of the mothers and forty-three percent of the fathers said that they would choose the same type of work.

When asked what they did when problems arose on the job, fifty percent of mothers and sixty-one percent of fathers said that they solved the problem by themselves. Into the rare response category fell thirty-six percent of mothers' responses and thirty-eight percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, the only category with sufficient frequency for analysis was the combined rare response category. In this category were seventy-eight percent of the mothers' responses and ninety-four percent of fathers' responses.

When asked what was the best way to get along with the boss or supervisor, twenty-eight percent of mothers and thirty percent of fathers mentioned doing the work well or properly. In the combined rare response category was thirty-five percent of the mothers' responses and sixty-four percent of the fathers' responses.

III. Personal Characteristics

Six significant differences have been found between mothers' and fathers' responses in this section (six items).

To the question "What do you think or do when criticized by friends?" a greater number of fathers (fifty-four percent compared to twenty-six percent of mothers) answered indicating a rational analysis of what they think or do when criticized by friends.

The same trend (twenty-eight percent of fathers as compared to eight percent of mothers) existed when parents were criticized by their own children: the rational analysis distinguished fathers much more than mothers.

To the question "What kinds of things make you angry?" a greater number of mothers (thirty-one percent compared to thirteen percent of fathers) indicated that the source of anger was the child. On the other hand, a greater number of fathers (forty-nine percent as compared to eighteen percent of mothers) indicated that the source of anger was the annoying behavior of others or work-related problems.

To the question "What do you usually do when you are angry?" a greater number of fathers (twenty-eight percent as compared to eleven percent of mothers) indicated that they controlled their anger.

Summary and Interpretation

Fathers seemed to demonstrate a more consistent control of their emotionality than mothers.

The child was a source of anger for mothers more than for fathers. This finding could be interpreted as due to the fact that the father is away from home during the day.

IV. Occupational Values

No significant differences were found in this section (six items).

INTRODUCTION

The parents were chosen by chance, so that eighty mothers and forty fathers were chosen to be interviewed. The interviewers visited the parents who were chosen at their homes and asked them to participate in the study. The parents lived in the center or near the center of the city of Ljubljana. The types of areas were the same as those from which the schools were chosen.

The parents were interested in cooperating with the study, in general. Only three fathers (2.5 percent) refused to be interviewed, giving as an excuse that they were too busy. It was observed that mothers were more willing to cooperate and showed somewhat more interest than did the fathers.

Mothers knew their children better and gave, in general, more exhaustive responses, especially concerning the achievement of the child at school. Fathers frequently said that mothers usually visited parent-teacher meetings and, therefore, knew more about the child.

For the interview the best students of psychology who were in the last year course were selected. The interviews were done by four students. Each of the students interviewed twenty mothers and ten fathers.

The training consisted of the following: first, the authors discussed with the students each question in the interview in detail; secondly, a preliminary interview with two mothers and one father was made. After that, another meeting with the students was arranged and the types of responses were analyzed.

Finally, we have no scientific study dealing with problems of family influence on child behavior and other problems dealing with the interview.

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

About three-quarters of the children in the sample (seventy-six percent) lived with both their parents. Twenty-four percent lived with one parent and relatives.

The age, social class and sex of the child had no significant influence on who took responsibility for him, both parents or just the mother or father alone, the frequencies being fairly evenly distributed on all three variables. Both parents were responsible for fifty-eight percent of the children, while the mother alone took responsibility for thirty-one percent of cases. Only eight percent of fathers were responsible alone for their children.

Fifty-eight percent of the mothers who were interviewed were born in rural areas; sixteen percent of them were born in various Slovene towns and only fourteen percent were born in Ljubljana. No significant differences occurred in grouping on the three variables on the basis of place of birth. A smaller percentage of fathers (forty-four percent) were born in rural areas; twenty percent were born in various towns and twenty-eight percent in Ljubljana. It may be seen that twice as many fathers as mothers were born in the city. Socioeconomic status showed a significant difference according to the place of birth of the fathers. More fathers of lower socioeconomic status came from rural areas (sixty-three percent) than did fathers of higher socioeconomic status (twenty-five percent). On the other hand, significantly more fathers of higher socioeconomic status were born in Ljubljana city (forty percent), than fathers of lower socioeconomic status (twenty percent).

There were no significant differences in the age distribution of mothers or fathers. The highest percentage of mothers (thirty-two percent) came in the thirty-five to thirty-nine year old group and somewhat fewer (twenty-eight percent) in the next group, forty to forty-four years. As might be expected, younger mothers had younger children, though the difference was not significant.

The same picture was observed for the fathers. But it was observed that there was less correlation between the age of the child and the age of the father, so there were about the same number of younger and older fathers. Sixty-six percent of mothers interviewed worked outside the home, and thirty-four percent were simply housewives. Significantly more mothers of higher socioeconomic status had a paid occupation than those of a lower one. Only twenty-three percent of higher status mothers were solely housewives as compared to forty-five percent of lower status. As might be expected, the occupations of mothers of higher status were significantly better (more of them belonging to the first and second occupation groups) than the occupations of mothers of lower status.

This was even more clear in the case of fathers. Fifteen percent of fathers of higher status belonged to the first occupation group, thirty percent to the second group, forty-eight percent to the third and five percent to the fourth. On the other hand, fathers of lower status belonged, in forty-eight percent of cases, to the fifth occupation group, in forty-three percent to the fourth and in thirteen percent to the third.

Mothers of higher socioeconomic status were significantly more highly educated than mothers of lower status. Of course it was the same for fathers, but a far greater number of fathers (fifteen percent) than mothers (six percent) had university education. Thirty-four percent of mothers left school when fifteen years old, but only eleven percent of fathers did so. Twenty percent of mothers and fourteen percent of fathers had less than primary school education.

Forty-four percent of families interviewed had been living in their present house for eleven years or more, while a further thirty-eight percent had been living there for at least five years. So the sample was a fairly stable one.

Sixteen percent of families had moved home more than once, forty-five percent had moved once and twenty-eight percent of parents had not moved since the child tested was born. In our sample, eighty-five percent of children had never left home for six months or more.

Forty-one percent of all children had never been in the hospital, thirty-six percent had been in the hospital once and twenty-two percent more than once. It is interesting that the children of higher economic status had been in the hospital significantly more frequently than the children of lower status. Of those children who had never been in a hospital, thirty percent belonged to the lower status group and only eleven percent to the higher. Perhaps better situated parents are more careful about the health of their children. _One-third of parents of lower socioeconomic status did not remember how old the child was when he was in the hospital, or how long he was there. There were only eleven percent of such parents of higher socioeconomic status. This difference was significant.

It seems that both parents tend to live together; only fourteen percent of fathers had lived away from the family for six months or more.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

This series of questions in the interview was aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his manner of coping with academic problems, as perceived by the mother.

Eighty-eight percent of mothers reported that their children had a positive attitude toward school, and only four percent reported that their children had negative or strongly negative feelings. Nine percent of mothers reported that their children had ambivalent or neutral attitude. In terms of achievement, sixty-nine percent saw their child as achieving above average in relation to his age group, while fifteen percent indicated that their child was below average or unsatisfactory and only fifteen percent reported their child's achievement as basically average.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The distribution of responses to the question concerning the child's academic performance shows a rather idealistic view by mothers of their children's achievement and attitudes toward school. This unrealistic view was much more significant for mothers of ten-year-old children.

The report of mothers on how children did their homework also showed the children in a very favorable light. There were no significant differences between younger and older children.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frquencies

The questions in this area were aimed at obtaining an assessment of parents' aspirations and expectations for the child.

There were some discrepancies between the parents' educational aspiration for the child and their expectations of the same child's performance. Thus while fifty-five percent of mothers would have liked their child to continue with university education, only thirty-five percent actually expected that the child would do so.

Sixty-eight percent of mothers wanted their children to have an occupation in the first, second or third occupational groups, but only forty-eight percent of them expected their children to attain such a job.

Only ten percent of mothers had no reservation about their children's choice of job; fifteen percent of them did not wish their children to pursue a particular profession, thirty-five percent did not want them to take a low status job, and a further thirty percent of mothers did not want their children to pursue a specific occupation.

Sixty-one percent of mothers thought that their children wanted a job in the first three occupational groups, so it may be seen that the wishes of mothers were the same as the children's and the discrepancy between aspiration and expectation was the same as that expressed by the mothers' wishes. Twenty-four percent of mothers replied that they did not know what type of work their children would probably do.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences on the educational or occupational questions.

2. Socioeconomic Status

In the educational area significantly more higher class parents would like their child to go to the university (seventy-three percent) than parents of lower class (thirty-eight percent). Significantly more lower-class mothers wish their child to finish only primary or secondary school.

There were also differences in expectation of mothers of lower and higher status. Fifty-three percent of mothers of higher socioeconomic status expected their children to continue with a university education but only eighteen percent of mothers of lower status expected this.

This pattern continued in the occupational area; significantly fewer mothers of lower class (twenty-three percent) wanted a job in the first or second occupational group for the child as compared to fifty percent of mothers of higher status. Significantly more mothers of higher status had reservations about some particular profession.

There were also differences between the wishes of children of higher and lower status. Forty percent of children of lower status wished to belong to the fourth occupation group. Only eight percent of children of higher status had such a wish. On the other hand, forty-eight percent of children of higher status wished to belong to the second occupational group, but only twenty-five percent of children from lower status had such a wish.

Differences also occurred in the real expectation of mothers of lower and higher status. Thirty percent of mothers of higher status expected their children to gain an occupation in the second group, but only ten percent of mothers of lower status expected this. On the other hand, thirty-three percent of mothers of lower status expected their child to work in the fourth occupational category and only ten percent of mothers of high status expected this.

3. Sex

There were no significant differences in this area but it seemed that mothers had greater aspirations for boys than for girls.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The answers to the questions showed that a large difference occurred between aspiration and expectation, but even this expectation was not realistic because a far smaller number of children than this actually attend the university.

The aspirations and expectations of the higher status group were greater than those of the lower status group. It was true in every case that children of higher status have better conditions to continue schooling.

The same was true of occupations. Mothers who expected their children to go to high school or university also expected a better job for them.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

Ninety-nine percent of mothers were able to list at least one activity in which their child was engaged and twenty-six percent of mothers indicated that their child had four or more activities in which he was interested.

When the question as asked about the joint activities of children and mothers, sixty-four percent of mothers mentioned some constructive activity with positive affect or enjoyment of interpersonal relationship between the child and his mother. Only four percent of mothers indicated negative interaction.

The most frequent activities of children with their fathers were also constructive with positive affect (thirty-four percent); followed by verbal activity (twenty-two percent), and nonverbal activity with twenty-one percent. A high proportion of children (twenty percent) were reported as having a negative relationship with their fathers.

When it came to activities within the family, indoor activities had the higher percentages (thirty-eight percent), followed by outings of various types (thirty percent). Five mothers indicated that their child did nothing with tne family, and only one mother mentioned that they went on holidays together.

A large number of children (sixty-four percent) did not belong to any clubs or groups. Only eight percent were members of an organized group, while fourteen percent belonged to sports clubs.

Thirty percent of parents indicated that their children had no hobby, but thirty percent mentioned that their children were interested in music or art, and fourteen percent engaged in sports as a hobby.

The most common job mentioned was general help (shopping, twenty-one percent), followed by cleaning the house (nineteen percent), and bedmaking (fifteen percent).

As far as reasons for having a job around the house were concerned, the most common one was that of learning skills (thirty-four percent), with that of helping parents in second place (thirty-one percent).

Fifty-eight percent of children did the jobs mentioned above without being supervised "quite frequently" or "invariably" and only thirty-four of them just "sometimes."

More than half the children (fifty-four percent) did their chores without asking for assistance from anyone else, though twenty-nine percent did sometimes try to get their siblings to do their jobs for them. Nearly three-quarters of the parents thought these jobs were carried out excellently or well, and twenty-percent were satisfied with the work of their child.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in the number or type of activities, but differences occurred in joint activities with the fathers. There were more joint activities between fathers and ten-year-old children. These joint activities were mostly nonverbal. Meanwhile, with fourteen-year-old children it was found that significantly more negative affect or lack of interaction occurred. Significantly more ten-year-old children carried out indoor activities with the family than did fourteen-year-olds.

Significantly more fourteen-year-old children were members of sports clubs than ten-year-old children, but more of the ten-year-olds were members of cultural clubs or groups.

Children who did jobs around the house were not significantly differentiated by age nor did the reasons for having the jobs differ.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The question concerning activities with the mother produced no significant class differences, but it appeared in joint activities with the father. Significantly more upper-status children took part with their father in nonverbal, non-work activities, or they had no interaction. Children of higher status pursued significantly more activities with their father than children of lower status.

Children of higher status were significantly more often members of sports clubs. There were some differences on questions concerning the family, but they were not significant. Children of higher status had more outings with the family than children of lower status.

Children of higher status were significantly more often members of sports clubs. There were some differences on questions concerning the family, but they were not significant. Children of higher status had more outings with the family than children of lower status.

A significantly greater number of lower status children (twenty-one percent) did not have any reported hobby.

Equal numbers in both classes had jobs around the house and the last significant difference which occurred in this area was that the children from the upper status asked their siblings for assistance significantly more often.

3. Sex

Significantly more mothers of girls reported more joint constructive and household activities with their daughters and the number of joint activities was also greater than the number of joint activities between mother and son. On the other hand, boys were closer to their fathers, and they engaged in household activities with them.

The sex of the child seemed to make little difference in the type of activities pursued with the family or participation in clubs or groups. Nor was there a significant difference on the hobbies question.

It seemed that girls were more diligent because forty-four percent of mothers reported that they did their job well or excellently, but only twenty-eight percent of mothers of boys said the same of their sons. More boys seldom or never helped at home.

c. Summary and Interpretation

This series of questions presented a stable family relationship with children participating in family activities and also interacting with both parents. It looked as if boys were closer to fathers and girls to their mothers, but negative interaction occurred frequently with joint activities with the fathers. This was much more significant for lower status families.

As might be expected, ten-year-old children performed more constructive activities with their parents, while fourteen-year-olds engaged in more verbal activities with them.

Joint activities were more frequent for ten-year-old children, while in the fourteen-year-old group of children there was found a significantly higher amount of negative affect or lack of interaction. In conclusion, it may be said that at that age difficulties between parents and children began. As to activities with the family, the most frequent were indoor activities such as television, listening to music and indoor games. These were followed by outings such as going to museums, movies, picnics and so on. These activities did not differ very much in different status groups or with age or sex.

A surprising and disturbing feature was the lack of any outside interest or hobbies in almost one-third of the sample, with significantly more lower class children falling in this category.

One interesting point coming out of the questions concerning jobs around the house was the amount of sexual equality. For this sample, at least, more or less equal numbers of boys and girls did the same jobs around the house.

Reasons for having jobs around the house included learning skills and helping parents, and these reasons did not differ from ten to fourteen years old.

More than half of the children did their chores without asking for assistance from anyone, but about twenty-nine percent tried to get their siblings to do their jobs for them. More children of higher status tried to do this.

Parents were mostly satisfied with the work of their children but it seemed that in this case girls performed better.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

Thirty-four percent of mothers indicated that their child would react positively to correction and a further six percent of children would react neutrally in such a situation by obeying without any indication of either negative or positive feeling. The percentage of negative reactions was smaller (nineteen percent). Refusal was mentioned by eight percent of mothers. Sixteen percent of mothers found it difficult to give a firm response about their child's reaction to their authority, and they indicated that it would all depend on the situation.

Mothers indicated that there were various reactions by the child in a disciplinary situation. The most frequent reaction was crying after becoming hurt (thirty-six percent when the mother criticized them and thirty-one percent when the father did so). Positive acceptance and an apology were given to mothers by fourteen percent of children and to fathers by twelve percent. Fifteen percent of children sulked or withdrew to their room when criticized by their mother, as compared to twelve percent when the father was the critic. The greatest difference between the children's reactions after being criticized was verbally defensive. Fourteen percent of children argued and talked back when their mother criticized them, but only five percent in the case of the father. Only one father was reported as never criticizing his children, and no mother did not.

The most common response to the mother's punishment was to take it well and apologize (twenty-four percent). The same percentage of children, on the other hand, reacted by crying. About fifteen percent sulked or withdrew and nine percent were hostile, while eleven percent of children did not show any overt action. The mothers of ten percent of the children reported that the reaction of their children depended on the situation.

Unfortunately no corresponding answers for reaction to the father's punishment were obtained. Nearly all the answers fell into the eighth category, where there was no information or the answers were irrelevant

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

As might be expected, significantly more ten- than fourteen-year-olds reacted to punishment from their mothers by crying, sulking and withdrawal. Fourteen-year-olds' reactions were distributed through all behavioral levels. Age played no significant part in how children reacted to criticism from either parent.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Differences between higher and lower status appeared in the reaction of children after being criticized by their mother. In children of higher status it was found that there was more positive acceptance and quiet reactions and less crying, sulking and withdrawal.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences on the authority questions but there were tendencies for boys to react more positively to discipline.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Having no relevant answers about the children's reactions to their fathers' punishment, the picture of authority in the family was not very clear. It seemed that mothers worked more with disciplinary restrictions than fathers. Significant differences in social levels and age also showed up; although this appeared only in the case of punishment by mothers and not by fathers. On the other hand, it seemed that in spite of the mothers' frequent disciplining, fathers had greater authority. After being criticized, children talked back and argued much more with mothers than with fathers. Differences between status and age showed that among ten-year-olds and children of lower status there was more crying, sulking and withdrawal. So children of lower status reacted in a more infantile way than children of higher status.

V. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

In the area of interpersonal relations, criticism by friends or siblings produced most frequently a mild reaction (thirty-six percent). One-quarter of the children (twenty-six percent) reacted strongly and six percent by withdrawal or a defensive reaction. Only four percent of children reacted positively, and twelve percent did not react in any way.

Mothers stated that their children got along very well (forty-one percent) or average (fifty-five percent) with others, and only five percent of mothers thought that their children got along poorly with other children.

When asked about peer influence, seventy-one percent of mothers indicated that they thought their children's friends influenced them generally and well. A further ten percent of mothers thought that the influence of other children was neither good nor bad, and eleven percent thought that friends influenced their children badly. No more than twelve percent of mothers indicated that their children's friends did not have any influence.

The responses given in a situation where the child's feelings had been hurt show that these children were sensitive to their friends' actions. Twenty-nine percent of the children tried to ignore or withdraw and thirty percent reacted with negative, depressed affect. Twenty-two percent of the children expressed their reaction in a hostile or aggressive way.

Stoical acceptance or trying to understand why the other person hurt their feelings was found in eleven percent of the children.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significant differences appeared among reactions to criticism by friends or siblings and reactions where the children's feelings had been hurt. While fifty-three percent of ten-year-olds and only twenty percent of fourteen-year-olds reacted mildly, only eighteen percent of ten-year-olds, on the other hand, ignored or withdrew when hurt, as compared to forty percent of fourteen-year-olds. This difference might be expected and indicated more mature behavior by the older children.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significant status differences occurred. Fifty percent of the children of lower status and twenty-three percent of the higher status reacted mildly to criticism. It seemed that children of higher status reacted either more positively or more negatively but they did not react mildly.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The replies to the questions showed that children react to criticism in different ways. Younger children of lower status reacted more mildly, while others commonly had strong reactions.

Ninety-six percent of mothers thought their children got along well or very well with others, and they also reported a generally good influence by their children's friends.

VI. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

Twenty-eight percent of the sample reacted to worry by talking with someone; and twenty-five percent were very depressed and lost control. Fifteen percent of the children reacted by withdrawal and specific behavioral responses, and fourteen percent of children showed lack of action or affect. Other reactions appeared to a much lesser extent. Six percent of children reacted with well-directed action and two percent tried to remain calm. But five percent of the mothers thought that their children did not worry at all. For those who did worry, academic problems were the greatest cause of concern for eighty-four percent of the children, as reported by the mothers. Mothers thought that other problems almost did not occur. Six percent of mothers stated that their children worried about death, war or health, two percent that their children worried about family problems and another two percent that they had personal problems. Only one mother thought that her child had "youth problems."

Thirty-five percent reported that when their children were worried they did not turn to others for help. Of those who did, twenty-four percent turned to both parents or only to their father, while twenty-four percent turned only to their mother. The remainder turned to siblings or someone outside the family.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant status differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences but it seemed that the girls more frequently asked for help than boys.

c. Summary and Interpretation

A frequent reaction when children were worried was a talk with someone. This may be taken as a positive reaction because in that way the child diminished his tension, and may have received some suggestion as to how to solve his problem.

Depressive reactions, losing control and withdrawal were also very frequent reactions of worried children, but this kind of reaction is less desirable and more damaging to child development.

The most surprising finding in this area was that the mothers reported that eighty-four percent of children had academic problems and that other problems almost did not occur. It may be suspected that academic problems were brought up most often and were most important from the parents' point of view, and that they did not attach weight to other problems so much. These findings seemed to indicate that curriculum demands for many children were not adequate and sufficiently adjusted to their intellectual aptitudes and environmental school and home conditions.

VII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

One-third of children (thirty-four percent) were made angry by petty annoyances inflicted upon them by others, usually peers. The causes next most frequently mentioned were parents and authority figures in general (twenty-nine percent), followed by major grievance (nine percent) and own behavior (nine percent).

The most frequent response to a situation provoking anger was withdrawing from the situation (twenty-five percent). Twenty-two percent of children engaged in verbal hostility and another fourteen percent some hostile or aggressive affect. Sixteen percent of the children reacted through depression or anxious affect, and six percent showed action or affect. The reactions of children when they got angry with their mother was not so different from when they got angry with their father. Nineteen percent of children reacted by withdrawal when the mother was the cause of their anger, and fifteen percent when the cause was their father. Other reactions which had nearly the same percentage for mothers and fathers were: control of affect (eleven percent and fourteen percent, for mother and father respectively), no action or affect (nine percent versus fourteen percent) and behavioral rebellion (one versus one percent). Greater differences occurred in negative emotional reaction, and depressive reaction, as twenty-one percent of children reacted to the mothers in this way, and twelve percent to the fathers. Children reacted with verbal aggression more often in conflict with the mother (thirty-one percent) than with the father.

When the situation was reversed and a friend was angry with the child, fifteen percent of parents admitted that they did not know what their child did. One-quarter of the parents reported that their children tried to accept this and reinstate the friendship; a further quarter of the children did not react or ignored their friends; fifteen percent reacted through hostile emotion or action, and a further ten percent by depressed affect. Only eight percent reacted by withdrawal or a substitute friend.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Ten-year-olds were mainly made angry by minor grievances (forty-five percent as compared to twenty-three percent for fourteen-year-olds) such as someone picking on them, calling them names and so on. Fourteen-year-olds, on the other hand, were frequently made angry by their parents and authority figures in general (forty percent compared to eighteen percent). Another difference occurred when children were angry with their mother. More fourteen than ten-year-olds withdrew to their room in such a situation (thirty-eight percent compared to thirteen percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

Only one significant status difference occurred in this area. More children of lower status became angry because of their parents and authority figures than children of higher status (forty-three percent compared to thirteen percent).

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The source of anger for children was usually peers, siblings or parental authority; but on the other hand, mothers reported that children were the main source of their own anger. So it can be supposed that with some greater patience and perhaps better coping response, a great deal of anger would disappear from the family.

Withdrawal, hostility and a depressive affect were the most frequent reactions of children to anger. When mothers were the cause of anger, children often reacted with verbal aggression.

Misunderstanding between older children and parents was greater. Fourteen-year-olds wanted some other manner of communication with parents, and not just authority.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

On the whole, parents were satisfied with their children's performance in school, as only ten percent showed dissatisfaction.

While only five percent of parents had never met their child's teacher, fifty-six percent of parents went to school of their own accord, and two percent went to school when there was some formal routine occasion.

Sixteen percent of parents replied that they did not encourage their children, and another sixteen percent helped only with their homework. But half of the parents (fifty percent) encouraged their children by discussing schoolwork with them and talking about its importance for the future. Only eleven percent provided encyclopedias for their children or took them to museums and on trips of academic value.

However, when it came to helping with homework, seventy-one percent of parents did nothing either because they considered their help unnecessary or because the child received a detention at school if he did not do his homework alone. The next most common reaction was a verbal reminder (twenty-five percent).

Most parents felt that school was very important, mainly as a preparation for life (forty-eight percent) and for socioeconomic reasons (twenty-eight percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Seventy-eight percent of the parents of ten-year-olds did not show a direct indication of either satisfaction or lack of satisfaction, while only thirteen percent of fourteen-year-olds' parents had such an attitude. It appeared that parents whose children had already gone to school for eight years had a much more clear attitude toward school. Parents of fourteen-year-olds indicated more satisfaction (sixty-eight percent) than parents of ten-year-olds (eighteen percent). Parents of fourteen-year-olds met their child's teacher at formal routine occasions and were less self-initiated than parents of ten-year-olds.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Parents of higher status more frequently encouraged their children with unspecified help or at home work than parents of lower status.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Mothers interviewed were almost uniformly interested in the child's progress at school; and all of them thought that school was important, first as a preparation for life and, second, for socioeconomic reasons.

Only five percent said they had never met their child's teachers, but more than half went on their own initiative. Among these were a higher proportion of parents who had younger children. Parents who had fourteen-year-old children usually went on formal routine occasions.

The most frequent help to the children at school was only that of attitude, that is, discussing the importance of schooling and so on. This did not appear to be an effective help.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

When they wanted their child to do something, sixty percent of parents made the request in a mild polite way, thirty-five percent of children needed an order or a demand, eleven percent a strong request, and only for four percent of children was a simple presentation or rational explanation sufficient. Forty percent of parents found that nothing was required beyond this, the children doing as requested. For those for whom some follow-up was necessary, twenty-six percent needed nagging or emotional appeal, fifteen percent reward or punishment and eleven percent a reminder or explanation.

If they found that their child was doing a job incorrectly most parents (seventy-nine percent) indicated that they would demonstrate or explain the correct way and leave their child to do it himself, but sixteen percent of parents would shout or punish him.

When asked how they disciplined or punished their child, thirty-three percent of mothers indicated that they used deprivation of priviliges, while twenty-three percent used a mild verbal reprimand. Eleven percent used strong verbal means or threats, while eight percent tried discussion or praise. Ten percent used physical punishment, but another ten percent indicated that they never punished their child.

When it was the father who disciplined the child, mothers reported that twenty-eight percent of fathers used a mild verbal reprimand while nineteen percent used strong verbal means and twenty percent deprived their child of privileges. Physical punishment was used by eleven percent and only three percent used discussion or praise. Eighteen percent never punished or disciplined.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant status differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The answers to these questions did not show the real picture. More than half the children were obedient and parents calm and patient. It may be seen from the other questions, where mothers reported that a major source of anger in the family was usually the child, that the real situation is not so ideal. The answer that children get angry rather frequently because of their parents' authority also showed that parents were not so patient.

III. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

Parents' help to their children in getting along with their peers consisted mostly of training (fifty-nine percent), with forty-five percent training by positive approach and fourteen percent training by negative approach, four percent used unspecified training, advice, and encouragement to social activity was used by six percent. Twenty-nine percent of mothers reported that they did nothing.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

The answers showed that the parents helped younger children to get along with their peers more than they did for older children. Of those who answered that they did nothing to help their children, forty-five percent were parents who had fourteen-year-old children and fifteen percent ten-year-old.

2. Socioeconomic Status

In this area there also occurred a difference between those parents who did not help their children. More parents of lower status (forty-three percent) did nothing to help their children than parents of higher status (fifteen percent).

3. Sex

There were no significant differences in this area.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Answers to these questions showed that parents' help in the social relations of their children consisted mostly of training and advice. The parents of younger children and parents of higher status frequently helped their children to get along with their peers.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

When their child was worried, the majority of mothers (sixty-nine percent) advised them to bear up, by offering support, suggesting they seek religious solace, or trying to reduce the tension in some way. Only four percent counselled direct action at the source, and the same number gave an ambiguous response.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

The most common advice of parents of ten-year-olds was to bear things (eighty-five percent), while only fifty-three percent of parents advised this to fourteen-year-olds.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant status differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Most mothers advised their children to bear up when worried. In this area parents can actively help their children by indicating effective ways of coping with worry. Of course, this does not mean that parents can help their children in all cases. But this indicates adequate behavior by mothers in helping their children.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

Over half the mothers interviewed (sixty percent) had not taken any courses or training since they left school.

Thirty percent of mothers had taken courses because it was necessary for their occupation, eight percent did some service courses, first aid for instance, two percent did domestic courses such as cooking, sewing and only one mother reported she had done an intellectual short-term course.

Most women had taken courses for economic reasons (twenty-six percent), and only six percent had the idea of self-improvement. Another six percent had some family or personal reasons.

Three-quarters of the mothers took the courses less than ten years after finishing their schooling.

II. Occupational Aspects

a. Description of Frequencies

Of the mothers interviewed, more than half had a job of some kind (sixty-six percent). Of those who did work, fifty-six felt positively about the job, three percent were neutral and six percent were negative, while some negative feeling also appeared when mothers were asked what they disliked about their job. The most frequent answer (twenty percent) was that they did not like certain characteristics of their job, and second, poor conditions (ten percent).

After being asked what they liked at their job mothers answered that it was variety (ten percent) and pleasant companions (twenty percent).

Thirty-eight percent of mothers would not have chosen the same kind of work if they had had it to do again, but twenty-eight percent would have chosen the same job.

When faced with problems in the job situation, one-third solved or attempted to solve the problem by themselves, ten percent sought help from co-workers or supervisors and another nineteen percent withdrew or denied the problem.

Two main ways of getting along with fellow-workers were mentioned by mothers: good social relationships (thirty-one percent) and tolerance (eighteen percent). Fifty-one percent of mothers indicated that the best way to get along with the boss was to do the work well and to do as they were told.

b. Significant Differences

1. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more mothers of higher status chose their job according to their own wish, and because of that they would choose the same job if they had to make the decision again.

c. Summary and Interpretation

On the whole, the attitude toward work among mothers seemed positive and we can suspect that they encouraged their children in a similar attitude.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

When mothers were asked how they reacted to criticism, responses varied according to the people involved. To criticism in the abstract, forty-eight percent indicated they would analyze it in a rational way. However, when the person criticizing was the husband, this figure dropped to forty-four percent, to thirty-one percent for friends, and twelve percent if the person criticizing was their own child. Other types of response varied accordingly. Fourteen percent ignored criticism, but only five percent when the husband criticized and eighteen percent when friends criticized. Two percent of mothers ignored criticism by their children. Another fourteen percent mentioned that they dislike criticism, ten percent for criticism by the husband and six percent for criticism by friends.

Fourteen percent thought they would get angry or argue if criticized, but in a specific situation. Twenty-six percent would argue with their husband, but only twelve percent would do so with their friends. Nineteen percent of mothers responded through defensive verbal reaction and six percent got angry if their children were the critics. However, twenty-one percent indicated that their friends never criticized them, five percent that their husband never did and twenty-two percent never received criticism from their children.

When asked what things made them angry, the most frequent answer was that the source of anger was the child (forty-one percent). The next largest (nineteen percent) was actions originating in the self, such as doing something bad or breaking something. Fourteen percent became angry because of strong annoyance and unjust accusation and another twelve percent because of the annoying behavior of others. Only one mother said that she never got angry.

When asked what they usually did when they got angry, thirty-nine percent of mothers reported that they reacted with verbal or physical aggression. Eleven percent tried to control their anger or to cope actively, while nine percent would withdraw from the situation. Fourteen percent reported that they did nothing while eight percent just became depressed.

b. Significant differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Differences occurred among reactions to criticism. Significantly more mothers of higher status would analyze it in a rational way (seventy percent compared to twenty-five percent). When the person criticizing was the husband, this difference was even larger. Seventy-three percent of mothers of higher status tried rational analysis (compared to fifteen percent of lower status). On the other hand, mothers of lower status would more frequently react with a defensive reaction and get angry at criticism by their husband (forty-three percent) than would mothers of higher status (ten percent). Higher class mothers reacted more rationally (forty-five percent compared to eighteen percent of lower status) to friends' criticisms. Another difference occurred on the question concerning what things made mothers angry. Significantly more lower status mothers reported that they became angry because of strong annoyance and unjust accusation (twenty percent) than did mothers of higher status (eight percent). The source of anger from actions originating in the self was also more frequent with lower status mothers (twenty-eight percent compared to ten percent).

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Four correlations out of a possible thirty-six were significant, all of them positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Implementation and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), while Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Attitude in the Academic area was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

Three correlations were significant out of twenty, one negative and two positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father, while Attitude in the Task Achievement area was correlated positively both with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

Two correlations out of the eighteen possible were significant, both of them negative. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

There were two significant correlations out of twelve, both of them negative. Initiation and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) both were correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

One correlation out of twenty-four was significant. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Four out of the thirty correlations were significant, three positive and one negative. Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, was correlated negatively and Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother, while Coping Effectiveness in the Nonacademic area was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

Two correlations out of the eighteen possible were significant, both of them negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child, while Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by another child.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

One correlation out of twelve was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

One correlation out of twenty-four was significant. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

One correlation out of fifteen was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

Four correlations out of ten were significant, two negative and two positive. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined both by mother and by father were correlated negatively and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated positively with Implementation in the Anxiety area. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Two correlations out of twenty were significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, while Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated with Coping

Effectiveness when angry with the father

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

Two correlations were significant out of twelve. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by another child was correlated positively both with with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, thirty correlations were significant out of two hundred seventy-five, ten negative and twenty positive.

Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, seven in all, five positive and two negative. It was correlated positively with Attitude Toward Task Achievement (Academic), with Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area, with Implementation in the Anxiety area and with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father. It was correlated negatively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) and with Activity Level, defined as the number of organized groups belonged to. Two variables were not correlated significantly with any other variable. These were Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

There were three significant correlations out of eighteen, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness and Attitude in the Task Achievement (Academic) area both were correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration. Engagement with Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

Three correlations out of twelve were significant. Coping Effectiveness and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated positively with reason for child having jobs around the house, a high score being related to child's personality development. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) also was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

There were two significant correlations out of eighteen, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school and negatively with Parental Conception of major function of school, emphasis on Task Achievement functions receiving a high score.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

One correlation out of twelve was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with reason for child having jobs around the house, child's personality development receiving a high score.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

One out of the fifteen possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with Parental Initiation in contacting school.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

Two correlations out of ten were significant, both of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated with reason for child having jobs around the house, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Authority x School - Table 24

Three correlations out of fifteen were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated negatively with two measures of Parental Concept of the major function of school, a high score stressing Task Achievement functions.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There was one significant correlation out of four. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated positively with reason for child having jobs around the house, a high score placing emphasis on the child's personality development.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There was one significant correlation out of the eight possible. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Aggression x School - Table 33

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Sixteen correlations out of two hundred eight were significant, three of them negative and thirteen positive. Two variables had five significant correlations with other variables. They were Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) and reason for child having jobs around the house.

The first variable was correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration, with reason for child having jobs around the house, Parental Occupational Aspiration, Parental Attitude toward Importance of School and negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school.

The second variable was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic), with Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother, and Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

There were thirteen variables in the Child Behavior area that had no significant correlations with other variables. Only one Parent Attitude variable had no significant correlations.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

There were two significant correlations out of twelve, both of them negative. Initiation and Attitude in the Task Achievement (Academic) area were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

There were three significant correlations out of twelve, two positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation, while Attitude toward Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

Eleven correlations out of thirty were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) area was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction and father-child interaction and with Positive Affect father-child interaction. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Activity Level father-child interaction and Positive Affect both mother-child and father-child interactions. Initiation, Engagement and Persistence all were correlated positively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction, while Engagement and Persistence also were correlated with Activity Level mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Five correlations out of a possible thirty were significant, all of them positive. Activity Level, defined as number of hobbies, was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction and with Positive Affect father-child interaction. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child and father-child relationships and with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

One correlation out of a possible twenty-five was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated negatively with Activity Level mother-child interaction.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

Two correlations out of a possible fifteen were significant, both of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children both were correlated negatively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

There was one significant correlation out of three. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

There was one significant correlation out of sixteen. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall twenty-eight out of two hundred thirty-five correlations were significant, nine of them negative and nineteen of them positive. Positive Affect mother-child interaction had the greatest number of correlations, eight in all with five positive and three negative. It was correlated positively with Initiation, Persistence and Engagement assessed on two different questions in the Task Achievement (Academic) area and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children, negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children and negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Aggression.

Fourteen Child Behavior variables had no significant correlations with other variables while two Parent Treatment of Child variables were not correlated significantly.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

There were two significant correlations out of twenty-four, both of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general and when criticized by friends were correlated with Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

There were two significant correlations out of twenty, both of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated with the child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father, while mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There was one significant correlation out of eight. Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated negatively with child's Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There was one significant correlation out of five. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There was one significant correlation out of three. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

One significant correlation out of two was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with child's Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, eight out of one hundred thirty correlations were significant, six positive and two negative. Two variables, mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism and Coping Effectiveness with Aggression, had three significant correlations with other variables.

Twenty of the Child Behavior variables had no significant correlations while two Parent Behavior variables were not correlated significantly with other variables.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There were no significant correlations between the two areas of parent behavior.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitudes

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There were three significant correlations out of the twelve possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism and when criticized by her husband and by friends all were correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

Four correlations out of a possible eight were significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated both with reason for child having jobs around the house and with Parental Occupational Aspiration. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by husband and by friends were correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

One correlation out of the three possible was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, nine correlations out of forty were significant, all of them positive. Three Parent Attitude variables and one Parent Behavior varible had no significant correlations.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

One correlation out of eight was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Homework.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

Two correlations out of eight were significant, both of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband both were correlated with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

There was one significant correlation out of twenty. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated positively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, four out of fifty correlations were significant, three positive and one negative. Two Parent Behavior variables had no significant correlations, while seven Parent Treatment of Child variables were not correlated significantly with other variables.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

There was one significant correlation out of six. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

There were three significant correlations out of twelve, one positive and two negative. Parental Initiation in contacting school was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school, emphasis on Task Achievement receiving a high score. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school and negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There was one significant correlation out of six. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school.

Summary

Overall, five correlations out of twenty-one were significant, three negative and two positive. Three variables had no significant correlations.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

Two correlations out of four were significant, one negative and one positive. Parental Implementation in schoolwork was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Nonacademic Task Achievement, while Parental Implementation of Homework was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

Three correlations out of ten were significant. Parental Implementation of schoolwork was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction and with both Positive Affect mother-child and father-child interactions.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, six correlations were significant out of thirty-three, five positive and one negative. Two variables had no significant correlations with other variables.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

Two correlations were significant out of six, both of them negative. Parental satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively both with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

Two correlations out of twelve were significant, both positive. Parental satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated with Positive Affect mother-child interaction; while Parental Initiation in contacting school was correlated with Activity Level mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

There was one significant correlation out of four. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There were no significant correlations.

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

Three correlations out of fifteen were significant, two positive and one negative. Parental Attitude toward importance of school was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction and with Positive Affect father-child interaction. Parental Conception of the major function of school was correlated negatively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, eight out of the eighty correlations were significant, three of them negative and five positive. Four parent Treatment of Child variables and three Parent Attitude variables had no significant correlations.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Description of the Sample

One hundred and twenty parents were interviewed, eighty mothers and forty fathers (i.e., forty mothers and forty mother-father couples). Half of them were taken from lower and half from higher socioeconomic status groups.

Child Relevant Items

Significant differences occured in the areas of Nonacademic Activities, Authority and Interpersonal Relations.

III. Nonacademic Activities

Significantly more mothers (thirty-four percent) reported engaging in three or more activities with their children. Only fifteen percent of fathers said the mothers engaged in that many activities.

IV. Authority

More mothers (thirty-eight percent) reported that when asked to do a task the child simply did it, as compared to seventy percent of the fathers who reported this response.

Significantly more mothers (thirty-six percent) reported that the child remained quiet when they criticized him. However, only thirteen percent of fathers reported that the child did this when criticized by the mother.

Thirty percent of fathers said the child reacted positively when they criticized him but only thirteen percent of mothers reported this behavior by the child when the father criticized him.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

In this area significant differences occurred on the question of what the child did when someone hurt his feelings. Twenty-nine percent of mothers noticed that children in such a case ignored or withdrew, but only ten percent of fathers reported this.

Thirty percent of mothers answered that children reacted with negative depressive affect, but fifty-three percent of fathers noted this reaction. The mothers' answers can be taken as more objective, because they were at home more, and it may be supposed that they knew their children better.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

Significant differences occurred only in the area of Academic Task Achievement.

I. Academic Task Achievement

Of the parents who answered that they had never met their child's teacher, a greater number were fathers (thirty percent). Only five percent of mothers mentioned that they had never met the teacher of their child. So it may be concluded that fathers leave the worry for the child's success at school to their wives.

Parent Items

In this area significant differences occurred only in Occupational Aspects and in Personal Characteristics.

II. Occupational Aspects

All fathers interviewed had jobs and fifty-three of the eighty mothers also worked. Approximately the same percentage (twenty-two percent versus twenty percent) chose their job because they wanted it. More mothers (twenty-two percent) than fathers (seven percent) gave as their reason for working external factors, accident, or necessity. However, almost twice as large a percentage of fathers (sixty percent) responded that there was no particular reason for their having that job, as compared to thirty-seven percent of the working mothers.

When asked about their job, sixty-two percent of working mothers and fathers gave simple descriptive responses; while thirty-seven percent of both mothers and fathers gave evaluative responses.

When asked how they felt about their jobs, again there was virtually no difference between mothers and fathers as most gave positive affective responses (eighty-four percent of working mothers and eighty-five percent of fathers).

When asked what they liked about their job, thirty percent of mothers and twenty-seven percent of fathers indicated that being with nice or friendly people was the most positive attribute. Special characteristics of the job were mentioned by approximately the same percentage of mothers and fathers (twenty-six percent, twenty-seven percent).

When asked what they disliked most about the job special characteristics were mentioned by thirty percent of mothers and twenty-seven percent of fathers, an almost identical percentage. Twenty-six percent of mothers and twenty-seven percent of fathers said there was nothing they disliked about their job. Of the rare responses, thirty-two percent of mothers gave this type of response as compared to twenty-five percent of fathers.

When asked if they would not choose the same kind of work again, fifty-six percent of mothers said they would, as compared to forty-seven percent of fathers. Forty-one percent of mothers said they would choose the same kind of work, while fifty-two percent of fathers would choose the same work.

When asked what they did in response to problems which arose on the job, thirty-two percent of mothers said they would solve the problem by themselves as compared to forty-two percent of fathers. Eighteen percent of the mothers said they would first attempt to solve the problem, and then seek help from a co-worker, which was similar to the twenty percent of fathers responding in this fashion. Thirteen percent of mothers (compared to seventeen percent of fathers) said they would first attempt the solution themselves, and then call upon supervisors for help. Twenty-eight percent of mothers gave rare responses, as compared to fifteen percent of the fathers.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, forty-seven percent of the mothers mentioned being friendly or having good social relations, as compared to forty-two percent of fathers. Twenty-six percent of mothers indicated that tolerance and understanding was the best way to get along, compared to thirty-two percent of fathers. Seventeen percent of mothers gave rare responses, compared to twenty-two percent of fathers

When asked what was the best way to get along with the boss or supervisor, seventy-seven percent of mothers indicated that doing the job well was the best method, compared to fifty-five percent of fathers answering in this manner. Seventeen percent of mothers gave rare responses, while twenty-seven percent of fathers did so.

III. Personal Characteristics

Significantly more fathers (fifty-eight percent) than mothers (thirty-one percent) indicated that they reacted to criticism from friends with rational analysis.

When asked what things made them angry more fathers than mothers (thirty-three percent compared to thirteen percent) indicated annoying behavior of others or work-related problems as a source of anger.

CHICAGO, U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

This section will detail the procedures used in locating and getting cooperation from parents, of children tested in Stage I, to be interviewed for Stage II, and will describe the interviewers and their training.

As explained in the Introductory Country Chapter in Volume I, the Chicago station had some difficulty in maintaining school system cooperation with the project and this greatly effected the procedures and success of our Stage II sampling. Ideally we would have (1) divided the student sample from Stage I into high and low achievers within each of the eight Age-Sex-SES groups, (2) taken their parents' names and addresses from the school files, and (3) randomly selected from each half an order of parents to approach for interviewing with credentials from the school approving and promoting our efforts. The circumstances for Stage II interview sampling were far from ideal and differed in the two school system areas, Gary and Flossmoor. In Gary we received cooperation on this task from the schools although it was somewhat limited. We gave the system a list of twenty names of children from each of the eight groups (if we had that many in a group) and they gave us the parents' names and addresses for these children. The system would not sanction the interviewing however.

We then sent the attached Letter A to the parents with their name and the name of the child typed in the appropriate space. A member of the interviewing staff visted the home a few days later, interviewed then, if possible, or tried to make an appointment. What followed then was a series of personal or telephone calls attempting to make an appointment for an interview. This continued until we were definitely rejected or accepted. Since the system would not supply us with additional names and addresses we tried to find other parents by matching children's last name, parents' last name and neighborhood. This was barely worth the effort except for the three parents interviewed whom we located in this way.

The range of area in Gary in which we interviewed covered the full house type, neighborhood range. Reports by interviewers best sum it up. One said she felt "shabby" interviewing a woman in such a magnificent home, whereas in some cases we had a male accompany a female interviewer because it was not considered safe for her to travel in the area alone.

The Flossmoor a somewhat different approach had to be taken. The school system would not help us at all. In fact we were asked not to mention the previous testing. Therefore we sent a letter to all people we could determine from telephone listings and maps as having the same last name as and living in the school district as one of our subjects. This meant sending many more letters than we had subjects and it was not feasible to follow these letters up personally. We enclosed a return card. If the card was returned saying that they had a child in our age ranges we interviewed the parent. If no card was received we sent a followup letter and card. (One result of this procedure was that we interviewed parents of children not in our sample, which were, of course, of no use to us.)

This procedure makes it impossible to say how many parents were actually contacted, or how many atively refused by choice or passively refused to be interviewed by neglect or happenstance. The Gary parents who were interviewed knew their children had participated in the study and would therefore seem to have a greater interest in the study. The Flossmoor parents who were interviewed did so because of interest or civic duty but not as much for personal reasons.

The interviewers were six graduate students at the University of Chicago. They were all members of the Cross-National Study staff at that time and had been selected for a variety of reasons, not just interviewing experience on which they varied from slight to nil.

The training was conducted first in a classroom fashion in which we read and discussed the meanings of the interview schedule, techniques and scoring. Role playing was used with the interviewers interviewing one another as if they were parents, followed by discussion of their role playing. Lastly each interviewer administered the interview to a local parent, not from our sample.

At the conclusion of the training the interviewers had all reached a high level of agreement on style, approach, and content for the interviews. It would appear that supervision over the interviewers was not adequate (it was the responsibility of this author) and that the level reached in training was not in all cases maintained in the actual interviewing.

LETTER A

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Committee on Human Development
5801 S. Kenwood Ave.   Phone: 288-5565
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Mr. and Mrs.

Last year the staff of the project entitled "Coping Styles and Achievement: A Cross-National Study of Children" tested approximately 1500 children, 50 classes, in the Gary school system. We, at the University of Chicago, are one testing station on this project that is being conducted elsewhere in the United States and in six foreign countries. All of the children tested around the world answered the same questions. The questions were about their behavior in various situations relating to school achievement, and their educational and occupational goals.

Your   took these tests. The next phase of our project is to interview parents of the children tested. We want to ask parents questions that are generally the same as those we asked their children. The interview will take approximately an hour and would be conducted at your home at your convenience by a member of our staff.

The interview will be strictly confidential. In fact, we promised the children that their answers would be confidential, also, and the interviewers will not know how your child responded to these questions.

The U.S. Office of Education supports this project and the School City of Gary has been assisting it. The project will hopefully give educators a better idea of children's behavior and its effect on their school work, their hopes and plans, and the amount of agreement between children and their parents on these questions.

If you agree to participate in this study, we believe you will not only spend an interesting hour being interviewed but you will also be helping in a worldwide effort to improve education.

One of our staff will call you in the next few days to answer your questions and make arrangements for your interview.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Guy J. Manaster
Project Director

GJM/f

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

Eighty-eight percent of the children in the sample lived with both of their parents. Three percent lived with one parent only, eight percent lived with a parent or parents and other relatives and one child lived with a parent or parents and non-relatives.

There were no differences between age, sex, or social class in who took the main responsibility for care of the child but the mothers reported that they took primary responsibility in seventy-five percent of the cases whereas only twenty-four percent of the mothers stated that the responsibility was shared by both parents. One mother reported that the father took sole responsibility for the care of the child.

Twenty-one percent of the mothers were born in the same town as they lived in when they were interviewed, twenty-four percent were born in a different town in the same state, thirteen percent were born in an adjacent state, forty percent were born in a distant state, and three percent were born in a different country of similar characteristics. Significantly more mothers of males (thirty-nine percent) were born in a different town in the same state than mothers of females (eight percent).

A smaller percentage of fathers were born in the same town (seven percent), the same percentage as for mothers were born in a different town in the same state (twenty-four percent), two were born in rural communities in the same state, eighteen percent were born in adjacent states while forty-four percent were born in distant states. Two fathers were born in culturally similar countries, and there was no information for one father. Thirty-six percent of the fathers of the fourteen-year-olds were born in a different town in the same state whereas only eleven percent of the fathers of ten-year-old children were born in different towns in the same state.

The same percentage of mothers were interviewed in each age group, the numbers being fairly evenly distributed on the three variables of age, class and sex. Twenty-five percent of the mothers were aged thirty-five to thirty-nine, thirty-five percent came in the forty to forty-four group and twenty-eight percent in the forty-five to forty-nine group. This eighty-eight percent of the sample came in the thirty-five to forty-nine age range.

Eighty-one percent of the mothers in the sample were housewives and there were no significant differences between the age, sex, or social classes in the frequency or type of the mother's occupation. The fathers' occupations fit the criteria used for sampling purposes whereby significantly more of the upper-middle class fathers (ninety-two percent) were from the highest two occupational categories, and more of the upper-lower class fathers (eighty-three percent) fell into the bottom three categories.

The social class differences used for sampling purposes showed up clearly for both mothers' and fathers' education. Significantly more upper-middle class mothers (eighty-three percent) attended or graduated from college, whereas most upper-lower class mothers (eighty-six percent) only had finished high school or had even less education. The same difference occurred for fathers' education. Ninety-six percent of the upper-middle class fathers had attended or graduated from college, while eighty-six percent of the upper-lower class fathers had a high school education or less.

Certainly for a United States sample this group is geographically quite stable. Seventy-five percent had lived in their present house for seven years or longer. There were no significant age or social class differences in mobility, but there were two significant sex differences. More mothers of males had lived in their homes for seven to eight years and more mothers of females had lived in their homes over fifteen years. This sex difference in mobility occurred also on the next question: thirty-nine percent of the female children had never moved from the house they lived in during this study, while fourteen percent of the males had never moved. Fifty-eight percent of the sample had moved once since the child was born.

The items dealing with the child's absences from the home or parents' absences showed no significant variation between the groups and only minor, usual absences were reported.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When mothers were asked to describe their child in terms of his schoolwork, nineteen percent responded in terms of positive achievement, while only seven percent reported negative achievement. Fourteen percent of mothers indicated that their child's achievement was average. Nineteen percent described their child's positive attitude toward school or his feelings toward friends or teachers. The greatest number of descriptions (thirty-two percent) fell into the "other" category that described the child's personal characteristics such as "studious", "lazy."

When asked how the child felt about school, fifty-four percent reported positive or strong positive attitudes, seven percent indicated that the child's feeling was negative, ten percent said their child had ambivalent feelings toward school, while eight percent were neutral.

Mothers, overall, felt that their children did average or better in school. Thirty-one percent described their children's work as excellent, and another fifty-three percent described their children's work as average or above.

The descriptions of usual homework behavior indicated that fourteen percent of the children put it off or didn't do it, whereas seventeen percent gave it high priority, thirty-three percent had no preference for when it was done, and twenty-nine percent had a regular time for doing it. Twenty-nine percent of the mothers saw a large amount of self-initiation in their children's homework behavior, but many of them felt that their children needed either a little push (thirty-eight percent) or a major shove (ten percent) to get started. Eighty-one percent of the children were described by their mothers as putting off their homework sometimes, seldom, or never while eighteen percent frequently or always put it off.

Presented with the hypothetical situation that their child had made a mistake in his homework, fifteen percent of the mothers said their children would not start over or would turn to others for help, seventy-eight percent of the mothers said their child would start over although twenty-nine percent noted unhappiness, anger, or pressure as accompanying the fresh start.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

Significantly more mothers of ten-year-olds (twenty-eight percent) described their child as giving high priority to doing his homework, as compared to six percent of fourteen-year-olds' mothers.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences in this area.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in this area.

c. Summary and Interpretations

By and large the mothers and the children, through the mothers, showed positive attitude toward Academic Task Achievement. However this attitude was not described in active, high achievement oriented language. Rather, one got the impressions of a more personalistic approach on the side of both parents and children to schoolwork, i.e., many children were described by personal characteristics not achievement, and a wide spread of methods for approaching homework were mentioned. These responses seemed notable in light of what might be expected by many for an urban North American sample. The interest and emphasis on achievement did exist, and is in some sense built into the interview, but was not so extensive as many might have thought.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

Seventy-one percent of the mothers would like for their child to graduate from a university, seventeen percent aspired to high school graduation or some college education. Thirteen percent would leave the matter to be decided by the child's ability or preference.

Fifty-six percent of the mothers expected that their child would graduate from a university, and twenty-five percent expected their child to graduate from high school and possibly attend a college. Fifteen percent of the mothers gave other unclassifiable, irrelevant, or don't know responses.

No parent aspired to jobs for their child in the two lowest working class categories and only one parent hoped her child would have a job at the top working class level. Fifty-three percent of mothers aspired to jobs for their children in the middle-class area, thirty-six percent of the mothers indicating the upper-middle class division. Eighteen percent left the choice to the child, while another ten percent aspired to any job that would fulfill their child and make him happy.

When asked what type of occupation they would not like their child to have, seventeen percent of the mothers had no restriction and fourteen percent didn't know. The remaining mothers had restrictions of some sort with a low status job (thirty-one percent) being the largest category.

The mothers described their perceptions of their child's aspirations. Sixty-four percent of the mothers felt that their child aspired to an occupation in the top three prestige categories. Twenty-one percent of the mothers did not know what type of work their child would like to do when he grew up.

Forty-four percent of the mothers did not know, i.e., would not guess, what type of work their child would do when he grew up. Forty percent of the mothers said their child probably would work at a job at one of the top three occupational prestige levels.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more upper-middle class mothers (eighty-six percent) had aspirations for their child to finish university than did upper-lower class mothers (fifty-six percent). Significantly more working-class mothers (thirty-one percent) expected their child to only finish high school than did upper-middle class mothers (six percent).

Significantly more upper-middle class mothers expected their child to have a job at the next to highest prestige level (thirty-three percent) than did working-class mothers (eleven percent).

3. Sex

Significantly more mothers of males (twenty-five percent) than mothers of females (six percent) indicated that they did not know how far their child would go in school.

Significantly more mothers of males (twenty-five percent) than of mothers of females had aspirations for their child to have a top level occupation. Significantly more mothers of females aspired for them to have a job at the third highest prestige level (thirty-three percent) while no mothers of males aspired to this level for their child.

Significantly more mothers of males felt their sons would like a top-level prestige job (twenty-five percent) than did mothers of females (six percent). Significantly more mothers of females thought their daughters would like jobs at the third highest prestige level (thirty-one percent) than did mothers of males (six percent). Significantly more mothers of females (thirty-three percent) thought their child would have the second highest prestige job than did mothers of males (eleven percent).

c. Summary and Interpretations

The traditionally high educational and occupational aspirations and expectations given by parents for their children were evident in these interview data. At the same time the class differences in aspiration and expectation were illustrated, by the upper-middle class mothers more frequently having very high aspirations and expectations for their child than the working class mother whose aspirations and expectations fell above their own status but did not imply large status mobility.

The mothers saw their children holding the same status and sex appropriate aspirations and expectations as they did. Although the percentages were not large it is worth noting that for all items a number of mothers would either not hazard an answer and/or attribute to their child sole knowledge about his educational and occupational future. The implication one might draw from these data is that at least a certain number of the mothers do hold an attitude that gives independence to their child for determining entirely his own future.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

This section deals with the mother's descriptions of the child's activities outside of school; what he does and how he does them.

The first item indicated the number of activities mentioned by the mother. The greatest frequency was for three activities (thirty-eight percent) with an approximately equal number of mothers mentioning one, two, four, and five or more activities. Only one mother mentioned no activities for her child.

When the question was the more specific one of joint activities of child and parent, forty-seven percent of the mothers reported some non-verbal non-work activity or one that mentioned positive affect in the inter-personal relationship area. Eight percent mentioned verbal activities while seventeen percent reported activities of a constructive nature. Eleven percent stated that there was some negative affect or an absence of interaction between their child and themselves. Sixty-eight percent of the mothers made only one scoreable statement to the question of what their child did with them.

Type of activity engaged in with the mother was coded in a second manner which indicated that twenty-eight percent of the mother/child activities were household activities and twenty-one percent indoor or homework activities, while fifteen percent went to church or on outings together. Eleven percent of the mothers gave irrelevant answers or no information to this question. The majority (fifty-six percent) of the mothers gave only one scoreable response to this question. The number of activities engaged in by the child and the mother which were mentioned by the mothers ranged from zero (eight percent), one (thirty-two percent), two (twenty-eight percent) to three or more (eighteen percent), while fourteen percent of the mothers gave no information.

Activities with the father followed a similar pattern; the main response being non-verbal activity or activity where positive affect was specified. This occurred in sixty-eight percent of the cases. Seventeen percent of the mothers gave irrelevant, nonclassifiable or no information to this question.

The second scoring of these responses showed the largest type of activity for father and child to be outings, church and otherwise (forty-four percent). Eleven percent of the fathers primarily did household activities with their child and fourteen percent indoor activities or homework. Seventeen percent of the mothers did not describe activities between the father and child that were classifiable in this coding system, and hardly any gave a second classifiable response.

Family activities were primarily outings (fifty-three percent), and vacations (nineteen percent).

The children belonged to organized groups or clubs in sixty-one percent of the cases, while twenty-nine percent of the children did not belong to any club, organization or sport group. The bulk of the children had at least one hobby, lessor or class; only eighteen percent did not. Fifty-one percent of the children engaged in a cultural activity and another fifteen percent had some sort of intellectual recreational pastime.

Almost all the children (ninety-four percent) had some sort of job or chore around the house. The greatest number of children had as their first job, cleaning house (fifty-three percent), and the second most frequently mentioned chore was cleaning the car (twenty-four percent). These efforts were decidedly family-oriented as the mothers listed only family chores (twenty-eight percent), or both family and personal types of chores (sixty-five percent), with only one mother saying that her child's chores were strictly personal. The meaning of these jobs came through again in response to the question as to why the children have these jobs. Thirty-nine percent of the responses gave the reason as helping out or sharing, and anther twenty-eight percent were for reasons of building a sense of responsibility.

Twenty-nine percent of the mothers said that they always or frequently had to see that their child did the chores, whereas the others reported that they sometimes, soldom, or never had to. Fifty-four percent of the children reportedly did not try to get others to do the chores for them, but twenty-six percent tried to get their siblings to do so. The mothers were fairly well satisfied with their children's efforts, seventy-one percent saying the work was excellent or good and only one mother saying the child's work was poor. Nineteen percent said that their child never helped around the house without being asked; twenty-six percent said they seldom did, but the remaining of the mothers said their children sometimes, frequently, or always helped.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

More mothers of ten-year-olds (thirty-one percent) mentioned two activities than did mothers of fourteen-year-olds (eight percent). On the other hand, more mothers of fourteen-year-olds (twenty-two percent) said that their child did more than five things outside of school than did mothers of ten-year-olds (three percent).

The mothers of fourteen-year-olds more frequently (thirty-one percent) said their child participated in more than three activities with their father than did mothers of ten-year-olds (eight percent).

The mothers of fourteen-year-olds reported more frequently (thirty-one percent) that their child went on vacations with the family than did the mothers of ten-year-olds (eight percent).

Fourteen-year-olds were more likely to belong to groups and clubs (thirty-nine percent) than were ten-year-olds (three percent). Ten-year-olds were more likely not to belong to any group or club (forty-four percent) than were fourteen-year-olds (fourteen percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

Upper-middle class children were reportedly more involved in cultural hobbies, lessons, or classes (sixty-four percent) than were working-class children (thirty-nine percent).

With regard to activities with the father, more upper-middle class children (Seventy-two percent) engaged in non-verbal activity or activity where positive affect was specified than did upper-lower class children (forty-seven percent).

More upper-middle class children (thirty-one percent) were reported as engaging in three or more activities with the father than were upper-lower class children (eight percent).

More mothers of upper-lower class children reported that their child frequently helped around the house without being asked (twenty-five percent versus six percent for upper-middle class mothers);while more upper-middle class mothers reported that their child helped sometimes without being asked (fifty percent versus seventeen percent for upper-lower class mothers.

3. Sex

As would be expected, girls reportedly participated with their mothers in household activities (forty-seven percent) more frequently than did boys (eight percent). Boys more frequently went on outings with their fathers (fifty-eight percent) than did girls (thirty-one percent). Mothers reported more girls (forty-seven percent) than boys (twenty-two percent) participating in one activity with their father.

Boys were reported as engaging in three or more activities with their fathers more frequently than were girls (thirty-three percent versus six percent).

Boys were more frequently mentioned as going on vacations with the family (thirty-three percent versus six percent) and also as more frequently participating in intellectual recreational activities such as collecting (twenty-five percent versus six percent). On the items listing jobs and chores boys were more frequently reported both on first and second mention as washing the car (forty-four percent and thirty-one percent) than were girls -- one girl only being mentioned each time. Significantly more boys than girls (thirty-one percent versus eight percent) never did jobs around the house without being asked.

c. Summary and Interpretations

The subgroup significant differences pointed up the rather unspectacular nature of the data on nonacademic activities. Overall the sample appeared to be a highly active involved group of children who dealt extensively with both of their parents in a variety of activities, belonged to groups or had hobbies and did many things around the house. The older children were more involved in more activities both within and outside of the family. Upper-middle class children were more active in the cultural activities generally thought of as associated with the middle class. And girls tended to participate more with their mother and in home and household activities than boys,who were more active with their father and in boy-type activities such as collecting and car washing.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

If asked to do something by the parents fourteen percent of the children either put it off as long as possible or refused to do it altogether. Thirty-one percent would do the task immediately, while thirty-two percent would do the task eventually. Seventeen percent of the mothers indicated that it would all depend on the situation, while four percent reported that the child would get angry but would eventually do the task.

When asked how their child would react when corrected if doing a job incorrectly, the most frequent response (twenty-eight percent) was that of negative acceptance. Fourteen percent would react positively while nineteen percent would react with no emotion.

The mothers were asked how their child reacted to discipline or punishment. The most frequent response was a positive one of taking it well, apologizing or discussing it (thirty-one percent) while the next most frequent response (eighteen percent) was hostile verbal or nonverbal behavior. Twenty-five percent of the mothers said their child would either sulk, withdraw, or cry.

The mothers were asked what the child would do in response to discipline or punishment by their father. Although twenty-four percent of the mothers did not respond in a scoreable manner, thirty-five percent said their child would take it well, apologize or discuss it, eighteen percent said their child would sulk, or cry, and thirteen percent said their child would respond with hostile verbal or nonverbal behavior.

The mothers reported that when they criticized their child, eighteen percent of them cried or got hurt, eighteen percent responded in a defensive verbal manner, fifteen percent accepted the criticism, nineteen percent of the mothers said it depended on the situation and eight percent said they did not criticize.

When the father was the authority figure who critized the child, the highest frequency response was sulks and cries (nineteen percent) followed by positive acceptance (seventeen percent), situational or other (fifteen percent), and defensive verbal reactions (fourteen percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

When told to carry out a task, significantly more ten-year-olds (forty-seven percent) would do the task eventually but not immediately than would fourteen-year-olds (nineteen percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences in this area.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in this area.

c. Summary and Interpretations

The authority relations described by the mothers within their family were seemingly rather quiet and not fraught with extensive battling of a verbal nature. This is not to say that the mothers saw the children enjoying being criticized but rather that for both the mother's and father's criticism the bulk of responses were accepting or taking it well or showing hurt feelings, with a smaller percentage of children verbally fighting back.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

Twenty-six percent of the children in the sample had jobs outside the home. Fifteen of the thirty-six fourteen-year-olds had jobs while four of the thirty-six ten-year-olds had jobs. Of those who worked, eleven had positive feelings toward their job as reported by their mother while seven had neutral or negative feelings. All but one of the upper-lower class children worked in order to help or for extra money. All of the mothers reporting said that their children worked hard. Eleven mothers said their child would not ask for help if he ran into problems or difficulties on the job, and eight mothers said their child would ask for help.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

Four inerview items were concerned with the ways in which the child deals with his peers in various situations or in general ways.

The mothers were asked to describe how their child would react to criticism from peers or siblings. The largest category of response was mild reaction (twenty-nine percent) followed by strong reaction (twenty-six percent) and withdrawal or defensive reaction (seventeen percent). Seventeen percent of the mothers did not give scoreable responses.

The mothers overwhelmingly felt that their children got on well with other children, fifty-seven percent saying that they got along very well, and thirty-nine percent saying their child's relations were average, friendly. The mothers, for the most part, did not expand on this answer and described the child's social behavior.

Generally the mothers did not feel that their child was being negatively influenced by his friends, only one response coming in this category. Thirty-one percent felt there was some specific influence, such as hair fashion or social habits, while twenty-four percent felt there was an influence which they could not evaluate as positive or negative. Twenty-nine percent did not feel that their child was influenced by his friends.

When asked what their child would do when someone hurts his feelings, thirty-five percent of the mothers said their child would react with negative depressed or anxious affect and fifteen percent said the child would ignore it. Nineteen percent of the children would express a "stoical" acceptance or cope with the problem whereas eighteen percent would express hostile affect.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

More of the upper-lower class mothers (forty-two percent) felt that their child was not influenced by his peers than did upper-middle class mothers (seventeen percent).

3. Sex

More mothers of males (forty-two percent) felt that their child was not influenced by his peers than did the mothers of females (seventeen percent).

c. Summary and Interpretations

The mother's descriptions of the interpersonal relations of their child showed a positive evaluation of their child's social relations and, again, a rather nonaggressive description of their reactions to critism and being hurt. They felt that their child got on well with others and, by and large, was not unduely or negatively influenced by his friends. Mothers of males and working-class mothers tended to feel that their child was not as influenced by his friends as did mothers of females and middle-class mothers. When criticized or hurt by friends the mothers did not see their child as aggressive but as being more sensitive.

VII. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked what their child did when worried, the greatest number of mothers (thirty-five percent) said he would talk about it with someone. Nineteen percent of mothers reported that the children would withdraw or exhibit some specific behavior that indicated worry to the mother, fifteen percent would get depressed, lose control or express hostile affect, and thirteen percent would try to remain calm and controlled. Only six percent would attempt to cope by goal-directed action.

Forty-four percent of the mothers felt that their child worried about school and academic problems and fifteen percent said that they worried about adolescent problems such as weight, looks, and friends. Another fifteen percent of the mothers said their child worried about issues such as war, health, death, politics, religion, et cetera. Thirteen percent of the mothers did not respond to this question in a scoreable way.

A majority of the children, reportedly, would turn to someone when they had worries, with thirty-nine percent turning to their mother alone and twenty-five percent turning to the father or both parents. Twenty-six percent of the mothers reported that their child would not turn to anyone for help.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

More mothers of fourteen-year-olds reported that their child worried about youth or adolescent problems (twenty-five percent) than did mothers of ten-year-olds (six percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

More upper-middle class children (thirty-nine percent) turned to their father or to both of their parents for help than did upper-lower class children (eleven percent).

3. Sex

When they had worries, girls were reported as turning only to their mother significantly more frequently (fifty-eight percent) than were boys (nineteen percent).

c. Summary and Interpretations

School-related problems elicited the greatest amount of worry in this group according to the mothers and the majority of children would turn to someone for help or internalize it with only a small percentage acting out. With age, the fourteen-year-olds began to worry about the problems more usual for their age group and the grander issues commensurate with their level of cognition. The relationships reported by the mothers here, again, showed the closeness of the mother/daughter relationship and the less frequent father/son relationship as exclusive resources for the child.

VIII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

These items dealt with what made the child angry and how he reacted to anger in general and anger directed toward various people.

Exactly fifty percent of the mothers said their child usually was angered most by petty annoyances inflicted on him by others, such as peers and siblings. Another fourteen percent of the mothers said major grievances of serious or long-lasting nature made their child angry. The remaining responses were distributed among the other categories and only one mother said her child did not get angry.

When angered, thirty-eight percent of the children reportedly responded with hostile behavior that was primarily verbal, fifteen percent withdrew and fifteen percent exhibited hostile affect.

When angry at their mother, thirty-five percent of the children showed it with verbal aggression and twenty-six percent by withdrawing. Eleven percent of the mothers said their child never got angry at them. Twenty-six percent of the children were verbally aggressive when angry with their fathers and twenty-two percent withdrew in that situation. Seventeen percent of the mothers reported that their child never or seldom got angry at the father.

The responses to the question of what their child does when a friend is angry with him produced a very wide and even spread across the categories. Eleven percent reported that the child would find other friends or withdraw from the angry child, seventeen percent would exhibit negative depressed affect, twenty-one percent would engage in hostile behavior either verbal or physical, fourteen percent would cope with or accept the friend's attitude, and thirteen percent would do nothing.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences in this area.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in this area.

c. Summary and Interpretations

The items labeled Aggression Items presented as giving the anger on the part of the child and tried to explain its origin and the manner in which it was exhibited. Therefore the descriptions did not tell us about the frequency of anger in the children.

The descriptions did give the impression of limited anger, both in frequency but, more importantly, in intensity by the children. The anger described by the mothers was most often of the petty annoyance type in which the child responded with a few angry words, showing angry feelings or withdrawing. This same type of behavior was most evident when the anger was directed at either parent. When angry at a friend the children seemed to engage in a wider variety of behaviors which may indicate either the greater importance of this type of anger for them and thereby a greater attempt to find means to cope with it, or could indicate that the mothers were creatively answering a question about which they had limited information. This last interpretation is questionable, however, inasmuch as a logical, though not quite significant, difference existed between classes in the preponderance of hostile verbal or physical reactions to anger at a friend, with working class children showing this more frequently than did middle-class children.

Parent/Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked how they felt their child was doing in school, of the mothers who gave no direct indication of satisfaction or lack of satisfaction, fourteen percent indicated that they gave the child no encouragement in his school work. But most mothers indicated that they showed their encouragement either by assisting in homework (twenty-five percent), academic support and enrichment programs (twenty-nine percent), or by their attitude (twenty-four percent). Most mothers had met their child's teacher; only fifteen percent had not. Sixty percent of the mothers met their child's teacher on formal or school initiated occasions. Fifty-three percent of the mothers reminded their child of his homework or checked on him, and thirteen percent were even more active in helping or coercing their child to get his homework done. Still, thirty-five percent of the mothers ~~did~~ nothing to help their child with homework, twenty-four percent of these saying it was not necessary.

Fifty-eight percent of the mothers said the main responsibility of the school should be to educate and another seventeen percent said it was to teach school subjects and culture. All of the mothers felt school was important, whether very or most important. The two main reasons given for the importance of school were preparation for life (forty percent) and economic (twenty-nine percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

A greater number of mothers of fourteen-year-olds (twenty-five percent) had not met their child's teacher compared to mothers of ten-year-olds (six percent).

2. Socioeconomic Status

More upper-middle class mothers said they encouraged their child through academic support and enriching actions (forty-two percent) than did working-class mothers (seventeen percent). More working-class mothers said they helped their child in unspecified ways or with homework only (thirty-six percent) than did middle-class mothers (fourteen percent).

More middle-class mothers said they had met their child's teacher on formal occasions (fifty-eight percent) than did working-class mothers (thirty-one percent).

3. Sex

More mothers of girls stated that the responsibility of the schools was to teach school subjects (twenty-eight percent) than did mothers of boys (six percent).

c. Summary and Interpretations

The group overall showed a less aggressive parental attitude toward their child's school achievement than many would expect, but probably the type of orientation that teachers see. The mothers were more active in assisting their child in getting his homework done but not in participating in the school itself, as indicated by initiating meetings with the teacher. A large percentage of mothers did not help their child get his homework done, saying it was not necessary. The middle-class mothers seemed to make their home more conducive to cultural and academic pursuits which were encouraging to the child's academic achievement but took a formal approach to the school as evidenced by the type of contact they had with the teacher.

It is worth noting that the difference in frequency of contact with teachers by age may be an artifact of the school organization at the different ages. In Junior High School students have a variety of teachers whereas the ten-year-olds have one major teacher. This makes it easier and more possible for the parent to visit the teacher of the younger child.

The mothers showed a more forceful and pervasive attempt to get their sons to do their homework than they did for their daughters. This may be an example of the differential importance placed on achievement by sex, or the result of the tendency for girls to do somewhat better in school.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

These items dealt with the manner in which the parents asserted their authority in getting their child to do something or correct an error.

When most mothers wanted their child to do something they reported that they merely had to make a mild request (fifty-three percent) although thirty-two percent of the mothers said they had to order or demand that their child did what he was asked. Thirty-two percent of the mothers said they did not need to follow up their request for their child to do something, while thirty-six percent had to remind or further explain it to their child.

Most mothers (seventy-two percent) reported that if they saw their child doing a job incorrectly they would instruct him in the right way of doing it.

When asked how they disciplined or punished their child, thirty-five percent of the mothers reported that they found deprivation of privilege most effective, while twenty-five percent used deprivation of movement which meant confining the child to his room or the house. Thirteen percent indicated that they never punished their child. Ten percent used discussion or praise but an equal percentage used strong verbal behavior or threats.

When it was the father who disciplined the child the mothers reported that twenty-two percent never punished. Seventeen percent used deprivation of privilege while thirteen percent used deprivation of movement. Fifteen percent made use of strong verbal behavior or threats while only eleven percent used discussion or praise.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There was one significant class difference. More fathers of upper-lower class children (twenty-five percent) used strong verbal behavior or threats as compared to six percent of the fathers of upper-middle children.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences.

c. Summary and Interpretations

The rather mild and placid picture of the relationship between parent and child that the mothers painted was reinforced in this section. The mothers were presented as requesting compliance of their child more than as ordering their child to do something and, in either event, receiving a good degree of compliance. Should they not, or should their child be in error they said, in effect, that they patiently instructed them in proper conduct. Would that it were this way. These responses would rank high on a social desirability index.

III. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

Twenty-six percent of the mothers said they do nothing to help their child get along with other children. The other mothers used encouragement of social activity (twenty-one percent), a positive training approach (fourteen percent), a negative approach by training their child in what not to do (fourteen percent), or unspecified training in doing anything they could (twenty-two percent).

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in this area.

c. Summary and Interpretations

The impression of a nonpushy, helpful mother as an overall description came in these responses. The mothers either stayed out of their child's way and facilitated his social relations, or were on hand to do what they could to help rather than leading and directing how the child dealt with his friends. And if the proverbial middle-class mother was in evidence at all it was in the difference between classes in encouraging social activity.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

Thirty-eight percent of the mothers advised their child when he was worried to take religious solace, reduce tension through activity, or gave him support and reassurance. Twenty-four percent of the mothers advised direct action toward the source of the problem. Eleven percent gave ambiguous, situation-dependent responses and eight percent said they would give no advice, while another eleven percent gave unscoreable responses.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences in this area.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in this area.

c. Summary and Interpretations

The mothers were highly supportive and even active in assisting their child in dealing with anxiety and the sources thereof. This was in keeping with the relationships described between the parents and children, although it did not seem to coincide with the school and teacher contact information and the school as a source of much anxiety.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

These questions had to do with courses or training taken by the mother since she left school and her reactions to them.

Sixty-four percent of the mothers had not taken any courses or training since leaving school, whereas thirteen percent had taken professional or academic courses, thirteen percent had taken short-term intellectual courses, and ten percent had taken some sort of recreational training courses.

Twenty-nine mothers had taken some sort of course work. Eight did so for economic reasons, seven for personal or social usefulness reasons, five for self-improvement, and nine for personal satisfaction. The courses had been taken from shortly after leaving school (twelve mothers), at present only (seven mothers), and over all the time (eight mothers). Most of the mothers who took courses finished them, twenty of twenty-six reporting. Thus, twenty-three of the mothers who took courses felt they had profited from them.

II. Occupational Aspects

a. Description of Frequencies

Eighty-one percent of the mothers were housewives and the working mothers' occupations ranged through the top four levels of the prestige scale. The responses to the items in this section were too few and too widely spread to warrant a discussion.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

These items had to do with reactions to criticism and anger. Speaking in general, the greatest number of mothers said they rationally analyzed the situation when they were criticized (forty percent). Twenty-two percent said they disliked it or took it poorly in some manner, while fourteen percent indicated that they would take it well.

Twenty-five percent said they used rational analysis and fifteen percent seemed to take it well when their husbands criticized them. However, twenty-two percent disliked it and took it poorly while twenty-one percent were verbally defensive and got mad when criticized by their husband.

When friends criticized them, the mothers were less negative and affected by it; thirty-one percent rationally analyzed the comment, twenty-four percent took it well or laughed it off, and eleven percent ignored it. Only fifteen percent disliked it with six percent getting angry.

Twenty-five percent of the mothers used rational analysis or rational verbal behavior, and twenty-nine percent took it well when their child criticized them. Thirteen percent of the mothers said that this would not happen. Eleven percent of the mothers said they did not like it and seven percent would ignore it.

When asked what kinds of things made them angry, petty and strong annoyances and annoying behavior of others accounted for sixty percent of the subjects. Twenty-one percent of the mothers said the source of their anger was their child or children.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant class differences in this area.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences in this area.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Four out of the thirty-six correlations were significant, one negative and three positive. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, and negatively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Nonacademic area while Engagement in the Academic area was correlated positively with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

Five out of the thirty correlations were significant, four positive and one negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother; Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father and both Attitude and Engagement in the Academic area were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

One out of the eighteen correlations was significant. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

Two correlations out of twelve were significant, one positive and one negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area, while Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

Four correlations out of twenty-four were significant, three positive and one negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general but positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) also were correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Two correlations out of thirty were significant, both of them negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father, while Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

Two out of the eighteen correlations were significant, both positive. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

Two out of the twelve correlations were significant, both of them negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area, while Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Four out of the twenty-four correlations were significant, two negative and two positive. Activity Level was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry both with the mother and with the father; Initiation and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

Four out of the fifteen correlations were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and when disciplined by the father were correlated with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children and Coping Effectiveness defined as getting along well with other children.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

One out of ten correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by mother was correlated negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Eight out of the twenty correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with mother, the father, and with friends. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry, with the father and with friends.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

Two out of the six correlations were significant, one positive, one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated negatively with Implementation in Anxiety, while Coping Effectiveness,when criticized by other children,was correlated positively with the same variable.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall forty out of the two hundred seventy-five possible correlations were significant, twelve of them negative and twenty-eight positive.

Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father had the second highest number of correlations, seven in all, two negative and five positive. It was correlated positively with Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic); with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother, the father, and with friends and Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations when feelings were hurt by other children. It was correlated negatively with Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) and Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends had eight significant correlations, six positive and two negative. It was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness, Initiation and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by father and when criticized by father and by mother. It was correlated negatively with Initiation and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

All variables were correlated significantly with at least one other variable.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

One out of the eighteen correlations was significant. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with satisfaction expressed by parents at child's Academic Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) -Table 17

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

Three correlations out of the eighteen were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness, Attitude and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated with Parental Conception of Major Function of School, a high score being linked with Academic Task Achievement functions.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) -Table 19

Two out of the eighteen correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School, while Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

Two out of the twelve correlations were significant, one negative and one positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with reasons for a child having jobs around the house, a high score emphazing child's personality development. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

There was one significant correlation out of a possible eighteen. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, a high score being related to Task Achievement functions.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

There was one significant correlation out of fifteen. Coping Effectiveness, when told to do something by the mother, was correlated negatively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

One correltation was significant out of a possible ten. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated negatively with the reason for the child having jobs around the house, a high score emphasizing child's personality development.

Authority x School - Table 24

One correlation out of fifteen was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Concept of the major function of school.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

Two out of the nine correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated positively with Parental Initiation in Contacting School and negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)- Table 26

There were no significant correlations

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

Two out of the nine correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children, was correlated with two assessments made by the parents of the major function of school, both of which related a high score, an emphasis on Academic Task Achievement.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

Two out of the six correlations were significant,both of them negative. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in contacting school and Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

One out of the four correlations was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Coping Effectiveness when angry with father was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Aggression x School - Table 33

Two out of twelve correlations were significant, both negative. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and when angry with the father were correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School.

Summary

Twenty-three out of two hundred seventy-five correlations were significant, eleven of them negative and twelve of them positive. Parental Conception of the Major Function of School had the most significant correlations, three negative and four positive. It was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness, Attitude and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) and with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations, defined as getting along well with other children. It was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father and with the mother.

Nine variables had no correlations with other variables. Eight of them were in the Child Behavior area and one in the Parent Attitude area. The variables in the Child Behavior area were Initiation and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother and by the father, and Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness in the Interpersonal Relations area.

The variable in the Parent Attitude area was Parental Attitude toward Importance of School.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic)- Table 34

Three out of the twelve correlations were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness and Engagement assessed on two different questions in the Task Achievement (Academic) area were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 35

One correlation was significant out of twelve. Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

Three out of the thirty correlations were significant, one negative and two positive. Coping Effectiveness and Attitude in the Task Achievement (Academic) area were correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction, while Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Activity Level Father/Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic)-Table 38

One out of the twelve correlations was significant, Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

There were three significant correlations, two negative and one positive. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Parental Guidance in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance, while Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Five out of the thirty correlations were significant, two negative and three positive. Activity Level defined by number of organized groups belonged to was correlated positively with Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction, while Activity Level, defined by number of hobbies, was correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in an Interpersonal Relations situation. Implementation and Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) were correlated negatively with Activity Level Father/Child Interaction, and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

There were no significant correlations

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

One correlation out of ten was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated positively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

One correlation out of ten was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

Four correlations out of a possible twenty-five were significant, one positive and three negative. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by both the mother and the father and when criticized by the mother all were correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parent in an Interpersonal Relations situation.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic)- Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) -Table 47

One out of the six correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parent in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

Three out of the fifteen correlations were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated with Activity Level Father/Child Interaction, while Coping Effectiveness, defined as getting on well with other children, and Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children both were correlated with Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety situation. None of the other correlations were significant.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

There were no significant correlations

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

One out of the two possible correlations was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety area.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

Two out of the twenty correlations were significant, Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother both were correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall thirty out of two hundred thirty-five correlations were significant, fourteen negative and sixteen positive.

Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction had the most correlations with other variables, six in all. It was correlated with Coping Effectiveness and Attitude in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by father and by mother, and with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with the mother.

Eight variables had no significant correlations with other variables. Six of them were in the Child Behavior area while two of them were in the Parent Treatment of Child area.

The Child Behavior variables were Initiation in the Task Achievement (Academic) area, Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother, Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father, Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father and angry with friends.

The Parent Treatment of Child variables were Actively Level Mother/Child Interaction and Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Parent Behavior and Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

Three correlations out of a possible twenty-four were significant, all of them negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated negatively with Initiation and Attitude in Task Achievement (Academic), Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated negatively with Attitude in the Task Achievement (Academic) area.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

Three correlations out of twenty-four were significant, two of them positive and one of them negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general and when criticized by children were correlated positively with Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated negatively with Child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

There were two significant correlations out of twenty, one of them negative and one of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father, while mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by mother.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

There were three significant correlations out of sixteen, two of them positive and one of them negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and by father.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There was one significant correlation out of six. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Activity Level, defined as number of organized groups belonged to.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There was one significant correlation out of the three possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Child's Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

There was one correlation significant out of a possible four. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Child's Coping Effectiveness when angry with father.

Summary

Fourteen out of one hundred thirty correlations were significant, six of them negative and eight of them positive.

Seventeen variables had no significant correlations, sixteen of them in the Child Behavior area and one in the Parent Behavior area. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, five in all. It was correlated negatively with Attitude in Task Achievement (Academic); positively with Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic); negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by mother; and positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with mother and with father.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

Three correlations out of twelve were significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general, when criticized by husband and when criticized by children all were correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

One correlation out of eight was significant, Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of Major Function of School.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall, five out of forty correlations were significant, four of them positive and one of them negative. Five of the Parent Attitude variables and one of the Parent Behavior variables had no significant correlations with other variables. Parental Academic Aspiration had the greatest number of significant correlations, three in all.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

Six correlations were significant out of twenty, five of them positive and one of them negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general was correlated negatively with Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction and positively with Positive Affect Mother/Child and Father/Child Interactions. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children was correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother/Child and Father/Child Interactions, and with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Interpersonal situation.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

One correlation out of the two possible was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

There was one significant correlation out of the five possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression was correlated positively with Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Eight correlations out of fifty were significant, two of them negative and six of them positive. Five of the Parent Treatment variables had no significant correlations while two of the Parent Behavior variables did not correlate significantly with any other variable.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 85

There was one significant correlation out of six, Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

There was one significant correlation out of nine. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the Major Function of School, emphasis on Task Achievement being related to a high score.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There was one significant correlation out of six. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated with Parental Conception of Major Function of School.

Summary

Three variables out of twenty-one were significant, two positive and one negative. Four variables had no significant correlations.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 88

There was one significant correlation out of four, Parental Implementation of Schoolwork was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There was one significant correlation out of the ten possible. Parental Implementation of Homework was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Degree of Guidance by Parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation was correlated positively with Activity Level Mother/Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There was one significant correlation out of five, Activity Level Father/Child Interaction was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Summary

Four correlations were significant out of a possible 33. Three variables had no significant correlations with other variables.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic)x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 95

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

One correlation was significant out of fifteen. Parental Academic Aspiration was correlated positively with Positive Affect Father/Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) -Table 98

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

Two correlations were significant out of the four possible, one negative and one positive. Reason for child having jobs around the house was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in a Task Achievement (Nonacademic) situation, while Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

There was one significant correlation out of ten. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with Positive Affect Mother/Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There was one significant correlation out of six Parent's Conception of the Major Function of School was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There were no significant correlations.

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were no significant correlations.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Five correlations out of a possible eighty were significant, three of them negative and two of them positive. Four of the Parent Attitude variables and five of the Parent Treatment variables had no significant correlations.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Description of Sample

Although it had been expected that there would not be any significant differences in this area between the mother and father reports, one significant difference did occur on the question referring to who had the main responsibility for the child. Twenty-four percent of the mothers but fifty-six percent of the fathers said both parents shared the responsibility. Seventy-five percent of the mothers and only forty-one percent of the fathers indicated that it was the mother only who had the main responsibility.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

There were no significant differences.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

There were no significant differences.

III. Nonacademic Activities

Mothers were asked what kind of activities they and their children participated in. Fathers were also asked what mother and child did together. Some differences emerged. Whereas forty-seven percent of mothers mentioned nonverbal activity or positive affect indicating enjoyment of interpersonal relations, only twenty-two percent of fathers mentioned this. Seventeen percent of mothers said they did work or carried out constructive activities with their children. This type of behavior was mentioned by forty-one percent of fathers.

When asked what kinds of things the child does with the family, mothers more frequently mentioned family outings. Fathers were more likely to mention vacations, which seems to imply that the everyday or weekly type of family excursion is seen as a parent-child, or family, activity by the mother but not seen in that light by the father who tends to view more extensive outings, vacations, as indicative of family togetherness activities.

IV. Authority

There were no significant differences.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

VI. Interpersonal Relations

There were no significant differences of note although mothers gave somewhat more complete descriptions of their child's interpersonal behavior than fathers, eighty-five percent of whom gave no or unclassifiable information.

VII. Anxiety

There were no significant differences.

VIII. Aggression

There were no significant differences.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

As would be expected, a greater percentage of fathers had not met their child's teacher than mothers.

II. Authority

There were no significant differences.

III. Interpersonal Relations

There were no significant differences.

IV. Anxiety

Mothers were more likely to advise their child when he was worried to seek religious solace, reduce his tension through activity, or to reassure and support him than fathers who came up with a greater variety of other responses.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

The fathers had, as would be expected, taken more courses of training since leaving school than had the mothers (seventy percent compared to forty percent). Fathers were more likely to have taken the courses for economic rather than other reasons.

II. Occupational Aspects

In the Chicago sample only thirteen of the mothers interviewed worked and there were only twenty-seven fathers interviewed, all of whom worked.

To the question of how the parent came to have the job he did, the only item with sufficient frequency was the miscellaneous or rare response where one hundred percent of mothers and of fathers fell.

When asked what their job was like, forty-five percent of mothers gave purely descriptive responses as compared to seventy percent of the fathers, a rather substantial difference.

When asked how they felt about their jobs, sixty-nine percent of working mothers gave a positive affective response, while ninety-two percent of fathers did so, again a fairly substantial difference.

When asked what specifically they liked about their jobs, the only codable category was that of combined rare responses. Here, seventy-six percent of mothers gave rare responses, compared to eighty-nine percent of fathers.

When asked what they disliked about their jobs, again the only sizable category was that of the combined rare responses. Seventy-six percent of mothers gave rare responses, as compared to nine percent of the fathers.

When asked if they would choose the same kind of job if they had it to do over again, forty-five percent of mothers said "yes" compared to fifty-nine percent of fathers answering in this manner.

When asked what they did when a problem arose on their job, thirty-eight percent of mothers said they would attempt to solve the problem by themselves as compared to fifty-six percent of the fathers, thus indicating somewhat more independence on the part of the fathers.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, eighty-four percent of the mothers indicated good social relations or being friendly, as compared to only thirty-seven percent of the fathers, a sizable difference.

When asked what was the best way to get along with their boss or supervisor, the combined rare response category was the only one large enough for analysis. Fifty-four percent of mothers fell in this category as compared to seventy-three percent of fathers.

III. Personal Characteristics

In general, mothers and fathers gave a similar spread of responses to the question of their actions when criticized. When asked about their reactions to being criticized by their spouse, men more frequently said they would take it well or laugh it off than did women although women most frequently responded in other ways. There was no significant difference in their stated manner of responding to criticism by friends, and by their own children. The only significant difference in the stated reasons they get angry is in the annoying behavior of others, spouse, and work-related problems. A greater percentage of males find these annoying. There was no difference stated in the ways they usually reacted when angry.

IV. Occupational Values

There were no significant differences.

AUSTIN

INTRODUCTION

The parents of ten percent of the children who had been studied in Stage I were to be interviewed in Stage II. The purpose was to try to identify parental characteristics and child-rearing practicies which might be etiologically related to the patterns of coping behavior and attitudes found in the children.

At the Austin station, the chief work was done in developing the detailed interview schedule for the interviews which were to be conducted in all countries. Once a detailed format had been worked out in draft form, it was circulated to all stations for their comments and the appropriate revisions.

Thereafter, three sets of interviewers were recruited, Black, Latin-American and Anglo-American, for the purpose of interviewing Austin parents in each ethnic group. Intensive, continuing training was given these interviewers. After several hours of discussion of the interview schedule, each interviewer conducted several interviews with adults who were not members of the research sample. These interviews were carefully reviewed by Dr. Hereford and the other staff members who conducted this phase of the research. Where the interviewers were not able to perform with full adequacy, replacements were secured. After the training interviews were completed, and the research interviews began, these interviews were sampled, reviewed for adequacy, and used for the continued training of the interviewers.

The sample was selected on the basis of the achievement records of the children who had been tested in Stage I. The children in each of the eight cells in the Anglo-American sample, for instance, were divided at the median for that cell on their composite achievement score (the average of their standardized Mathematics and Reading Achievement scores). Each cell was thus divided into a top and bottom half, on child achievement. The ultimate aim was to obtain interviews with ten parents in each cell, five from the top half and five from the bottom half. In order to be sure of enough complete interviews, a random selection was made of thirty children from the top half of the cell and thirty from the bottom half of the cell. Interviews were sought with the mothers of the children on this list until complete interviews were obtained with five mothers of high-achieving children in each cell, and five mothers of low-achieving children in each cell.

Since interviews were also sought with half as many fathers, three fathers of high-achieving children and two of low-achieving children were targeted as informants. Thus, one condition for the selection of the mothers whose interviews ultimately were used, was the availability of an interview with the father in half of the families where the mother could be interviewed.

The chief practical problem was arranging appointments to meet with mothers and fathers to discuss the purpose of the interviewing and to set up a time to conduct it. Needless to say, it was far harder to contact fathers and arrange for the interview than to reach the mothers. The actual refusal rate was very low. Once an interviewer had been able to meet with the parent or parents, it was possible to set up a subsequent interview with very few refusals.

Once the parents understood the purpose of the study and of the interview, they generally evidenced real personal interest. There were no complaints following any of the interviews that it had invaded family privacy, touched on unduly sensitive issues, or otherwise offended or upset either parent. Unquestionably, considerable credit for this positive outcome must be given to the tact and good judgment of the selected interviewers, and to the extreme care and alertness with which the interviewer training was conducted, throughout the study. Another factor which probably helped was the care taken to match the ethnicity of the interviewer to the ethnic background of the parents to be interviewed. It was not solely a matter of putting the parents at ease. We found that the interviewers of a given ethnic group had a good many points of special knowledge and insight which made it possible for them to probe beyond overly-general answers, or rephrase questions in such a way as to elicit much more full and frank statements from the parents, within the natural limits of frankness which any such interviewing inevitably encounters.

In the end, a ten percent sample of parents from each of the eight cells in the Anglo-American sample were interviewed. All of the mothers in this sample were interviewed, and half of the fathers, in each cell. In the Latin-American and Black samples, twenty percent of the mothers and ten percent of the fathers in each of the cells were interviewed. This was done in order to achieve the same number of respondents as in the Anglo-American sample, which was the minimum number necessary for statistical analysis.

MOTHER DESCRIPTIONS - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

Description of the Sample

Approximately ninety-five percent of the sample tested lived with both parents. Two fourteen-year-old males, one upper-lower and one upper-middle lived with one parent only. Three ten-year-old upper-lower class subjects (one male and two females) lived with their parents plus other relatives. There were no significant age, sex, or socioeconomic class differences found with this variable.

In approximately fifty-five percent of the cases, both parents were responsible for caring for the child, while in approximately forty-five percent of cases, the main responsibility lay with the mother only. There were no significant sex or social class differences in this variable. However, there was a significant age difference. A much larger percentage of mothers of fourteen-year-olds reported that both parents were responsible for the child, while a significantly larger number of mothers of ten-year-olds reported that the mother herself had the primary responsibility for the child. Therefore, as the child becomes older, apparently there is a tendency for both parents to take responsibility for the child, while younger children are more often primarily handled by the mother.

Approximately fourteen percent of the mothers sampled were born in the same town as that where they resided at the time of the interview. Approximately twelve percent of the mothers were born in different towns in the same state. Approximately forty percent of the mothers were born in rural areas, while around eleven percent were born in an adjacent state. The remaining twenty-four percent of the mothers were either born in nonadjacent states or in different countries. There were no significant sex or age differences in the birthplace of the mother. However, there was a significant social class difference in the number of mothers who were born in a different town in the same state, with far more upper-middle class mothers fitting into this category.

Of the fathers of these children in the subsample, approximately fifteen percent were born in the same town, while around six percent were born in a different town in the same state Approximately forty percent of the fathers in the sample were born in a rural area. Fifteen percent were born in an adjacent state, while around twenty-five percent were born in a different, but nonadjacent state. There were no significant age or social class differences in the birthplace of the father. One significant sex difference involved the frequency of fathers being born in an adjacent state with more females having fathers born in adjacent states This difference is not readily explicable.

Approximately fifteen percent of the mothers' ages were between twenty-five and thirty-four at the time of the interview. Approximately thirty percent of the mothers were between thirty-five and thirty-nine; while twenty-five percent of them were between forty and forty-four years of age. Twenty-two percent were between ages forty-five and forty-nine, while the remaining nine percent were in the fifty to sixty-four age bracket. There were no sex or social class differences in the ages of the mothers. However, there was a significant age difference with a larger proportion of mothers of ten-year-olds falling in the twenty-five to thirty-four year old bracket, while a larger proportion of mothers of the fourteen-year-olds were in the forty-five to forty-nine year old age bracket.

Nineteen percent of the fathers were in the twenty-five to thirty-nine year old age bracket. Thirty-three percent were in the forty to forty-four year old age bracket and twenty percent in the forty-five to forty-nine year old age bracket. Approximately fifteen percent were in the fifty to fifty-four year old age bracket, while the remaining fourteen percent were fifty-five and over. There were no significant sex differences in the ages of the fathers. One significant socioeconomic class difference involved the proportion of fathers in the fifty-five and over age bracket. There were more upper-lower fathers in this age bracket than there were upper-middle class fathers. Significant age differences were also observed. This difference involved primarily the forty to forty-four and forty-five to forty-nine year old age brackets. There were more fathers of ten-year-olds in the forty to forty-four year old age bracket, while more of the fathers of fourteen-year-olds were in the forty-five to forty-nine year old age bracket.

Only two of the mothers interviewed had jobs rated as belonging to the upper two socioeconomic status levels. Twenty percent of the mothers had jobs rated at level three while sixteen percent had jobs rated at level four. Five percent of the mothers had jobs rated at level five while another five percent had jobs rated at socioeconomic status level six. Fifty-three percent of the mothers were housewives who did not work outside of the home. There were no significant age differences in the mothers' work. There was an overall significant sex difference which included a greater tendency for the mothers of females to have jobs rated in the levels three and four of the socioeconomic status level scale. There was an overall significant social class difference as well as three individual category significant differences. There was a far higher proportion of upper-lower class mothers working at level four type jobs than there were upper-middle class mothers. Also, around twice as many upper-middle class mothers as upper-lower class mothers listed their only job as housewife. Ten times as many upper-lower mothers as upper-middle class mothers were classified in the miscellaneous category, which included primarly levels five and six jobs.

Fourteen percent of the fathers in the interview subsample had jobs classified as level one on the socioeconomic status scale. Thirty-two percent were classified as level two, while eighteen percent were classified as level three. Approximately twenty-four percent were classified as level four while the remaining fifteen percent were classified as levels five and six combined. There were no significant age or sex differences in the status level of the fathers' occupations. There was a highly significant overall social class difference as well as a number of individual category social class differences. As would be expected, far more upper-middle class fathers were classified as having level one or level two type jobs, while a far greater proportion of upper-lower class fathers had jobs classified as representing socioeconomic status levels four and five.

Approximately sixteen percent of the mothers interviewed were university graduates, while thirty percent had at least some college education. Thirty-three percent of the mothers were classified as high school graduates, while fourteen percent indicated that they had some high school training. Only five percent indicated that they reached only the eighth grade while less than five percent indicated that they had completed less than eight grades. There were no significant age or sex differences in the mothers' educational level. There was, however, a highly significant overall socioeconomic class difference as well as several individual category differences. A far larger proportion of upper-middle class mothers were college graduates or had at least some college education. Also, a larger proportion of upper-lower class than upper-middle class mothers had some high school training but did not complete high school.

Thirty percent of the fathers in the interview subsample were reported as being university graduates while twenty percent were reported as having some college training. Fifteen percent of the fathers were high school graduates while another twenty-three percent had some high school training but were not high school graduates. Five percent of the fathers were eighth grade graduates, while the remaining five percent completed less than eight grades in school. There were no significant age or sex differences in the fathers' educational level. There was a highly significant overall socioeconomic class difference as well as individual category significant differences. As would be expected, a far greater proportion of upper-middle class than upper-lower class fathers were university graduates or had some college training. Conversely, a larger proportion of upper-lower class fathers had some high school training, but were not high school graduates, or had completed eight grades or less.

One percent of the parents interviewed had lived in their present home less than one year. Ten percent had lived in their present home between one and two years, while sixteen had lived there between three and four years. Twenty-three percent had lived in their present home between five and six years. Thirteen percent had lived there between seven and eight years, and seven percent had lived there between nine and ten years. Eleven percent had lived in their present home between eleven and fourteen years, while the remaining twenty-one percent had lived there over fifteen years. There were no sex or socioeconomic class differences in the length of time the parents had resided in their present home. There was a significant overall age difference as well as a difference in the proportion of parents residing in their present home over fifteen years. A larger proportion of the parents of fourteen-year-olds as compared to those of ten-year-olds had resided in their present home for fifteen years or more.

Twenty-nine percent of the parents stated that they had not lived anywhere else since the subject was born, while thirty-three percent said that they had lived in one other place. Seventeen percent said that they had lived in two other places since the subject was born, while twenty-one percent said that they had lived in three or more places. There were no significant age, sex or social class differences in the number of places the parents had lived since the subject was born.

No child in this subsample had been away from home for six months or more.

Approximately sixty-five percent of the children in this sample have never been in the hospital, while twenty-two percent have been in the hospital once. Thirteen percent have been in the hospital two or more times. There were no significant age, sex or socioeconomic class differences in the frequency of the child's admission to the hospital. Of those who had been in the hospital (approximately thirty-five percent), fifteen percent were in for a total duration of only one to three days. Five percent were in the hospital between four and seven days, and another five percent were in between eight and fifteen days. Only two children were in the hospital between sixteen and thirty days, and only one child was in the hospital over thirty days. There were no significant age, sex or socioeconomic class differences in the child's length of stay in the hospital.

Of those children who have been in the hospital at least once, around eleven percent were first admitted when they were two years old or less. Around six percent were first admitted between the ages of three and five, while the remainder (sixteen percent) were first admitted when they were six or older. There were no significant age, sex, or socioeconomic class differences in age of first admission to the hospital.

In eighty-four percent of the subsample interviewed, neither parent had been away from home at any time for six months or more. For sixteen percent of the sample, the father had been away from home for a period of at least six months. There were no significant age, sex, or socioeconomic class differences in whether or not one or more parents had been away from home for a prolonged period. For the sixteen percent whose fathers had been away from home for a prolonged period, the reasons for separation were as follows: travel related to work (three cases), military obligations (three cases), health of father (five cases) and miscellaneous (two cases). None of these frequencies were high enough to permit chi-square analysis.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

Approximately thirty percent indicated that their child performed well academically in school, while eleven percent indicated that their child's performance was ambivalent. Another eleven percent of the mothers said that their child's performance was average, while five percent of the mothers interviewed described their child's school performance as being poor. Approximately fifteen percent of the mothers reported that their child had positive general or interpersonally-oriented attitudes toward school, while less than four percent of mothers reported that their child had neutral or negative attitudes toward school. Approximately twenty percent of the responses were relevant to the question but were unclassifiable.

Seventeen percent of the mothers interviewed thought that their child had very strong positive feelings toward school, while another fifty-six percent described their child's feeling also as being positive, but not as strongly positive. Around six percent of the mothers said their child was ambivalent toward school, while another nine percent described their child's feelings toward school as neutral. Seven percent of the mothers said that their child had negative or strong negative feelings toward school. An additional five percent gave responses descriptive of the child's behavior in school which could not be classified as to type of attitude expressed.

Thirty percent of the mothers interviewed thought that their child's performance in school was excellent, while another twenty-six percent felt that the child's performance was well above average. Approximately another nine percent of the mothers saw their child as being barely above average, while twenty percent thought that their child was completely average in school performance. Less than four percent of the mothers saw their child's performance as being below average, while an additional four percent viewed their child's performance as poor or unsatisfactory.

Only two of the mothers interviewed claimed that their child seldom or never had any homework to do. Twenty-seven percent of the mothers simply indicated that the child did the homework without mentioning any specific priorities, while eighteen percent of the mothers reported that the child's homework had high priority. Twenty percent of the mothers said that the child did his homework at a regular time and another twelve percent said that the child had no regular specific time set aside for doing his homework. Twenty percent of the mothers indicated that their child attempted to avoid or refused to do homework. Further queried about the details of the subject's homework behavior, twenty-one percent of the mothers described their child's homework behavior as completely self-initiated, while another fifty percent described the child as being basically self-initiating or occasionally needing to be reminded to do his homework. Approximately fourteen percent of the mothers indicated that the child needed to be reminded or forced to do his homework. Only one mother responded by describing the child's affective state concerning his homework, while five of the mothers described the basic conditions under which the homework was performed. Additional homework information indicated that only two of the children consistently put off their homework to do other things, while eighteen percent frequently put off doing their homework. Twenty percent of the mothers indicated that the child sometimes procrastinated in doing his homework, while thirty-nine percent indicated that the child seldom puts off doing this work. Another twenty percent of the mothers stated that the child never procrastinated in doing his homework.

Upon discovering that the homework was being done incorrectly, forty percent of the mothers stated their child would simply begin again, while another twenty-two percent indicated that the child would start over, but would be unhappy about the situation. Twelve percent of the mothers indicated that the child would start over, but would be angry about the situation. Only five percent of the mothers indicated that the child's response was dependent on the teacher or the subject matter involved, while another five percent indicated that the child would seek aid or advice in such a situation. Only three mothers said their child would not start over again. Nine percent of the mothers said that such a situation would make the child anxious or upset without indicating whether or not the child would do anything to rectify the situation.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was a significant overall age chi-square on the item which described the child's relationship to school. The only specific category showing a significant difference was that used for classifying all responses which were relevant to the item but unclassifiable. The mothers of fourteen-year-old children gave more of these responses than did the mothers of ten-year-old children. Another significant age difference concerned the subject's behavior when confronted with homework. A significantly larger proportion of the mothers of fourteen-year-olds as compared to mothers of ten-year-olds indicated that the homework did get done, without any reference as to when or in what manner. In addition, according to the mothers, significantly more fourteen-year-olds than ten-year-olds initiated their own homework behavior at all times.

2. Socioeconomic Status

In describing their child's attitude toward school, significantly more upper-lower class mothers than upper-middle class mothers said that their child had a positive general or interpersonally-oriented attitude toward school. This was the only significant socioeconomic class difference observed.

3. Sex

The mothers of girls in the subsample reported significantly more often that their child had strong positive attitudes toward school than did the mothers of boys. This was the only sex difference observed in the subsample.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

Eighty-six percent of the mothers interviewed said that they wanted their child to complete college, and seventy percent said that their child would actually complete college. Only six percent of the mothers wanted their child to have only some college education. Only three mothers indicated that all that they desired for their child was a high school degree, but eleven percent indicated that this was as far as their child would probably go in school. No mothers indicated a desire to see their child stop school prior to high school graduation and only one mother indicated that she felt that her child would not graduate from high school.

Ten percent of the mothers stated that they wished for their child to have a job classified at socioeconomic status level one, the highest level. Approximately thirteen percent of the mothers preferred their child to have a level two type of job and around twenty-nine percent preferred a level three type of job. Only one mother indicated a desire for her child to have a level four type job, and no mothers preferred levels five or six. Only three mothers indicated that they wanted their child (presumably daughter) to be a housewife. Approximately twenty percent of the mothers indicated that their only desire was for the child to pursue whatever career he wished, while another nine percent indicated that whatever was decent and would make the child happy was acceptable to them. Finally, six percent of the mothers had no preferences concerning the child's future career. Queried concerning types of jobs they did not want their child to have, ten percent of the mothers said that there was no particular type of job that they wanted their child to avoid. Only two of the mothers mentioned a specific high-level profession, while thirty indicated specific low-status jobs as being undesirable. Twenty-one percent mentioned specific jobs which were in the middle status ranges, while another seven percent did not want their child to have any job unsuited to his temperament or ability. Ten percent of the mothers mentioned illegal or immoral professions.

Nine percent of the mothers thought that their child aspired to the highest (level one) status level job, while twenty-three percent saw their child as aspiring to a level two type of job. Thus, around thirty-two percent of mothers saw their child as aspiring to an upper-middle class profession. Thirty-nine percent of the mothers felt that their child aspired to a level three type job, while less than five percent of the mothers thought that their child aspired to a job classified as level four, five or six. Only one mother thought that her child wanted to be a housewife, and another two mothers thought that their child had no job preference at that time. Another eleven percent of the mothers had no ideas as to what job their child desired.

Seven percent of the mothers felt that the child would actually achieve a level one type profession, while an additional twelve percent felt that the child would achieve a level two type of job. Thus, less than twenty percent of the mothers thought that their child would actually achieve an upper-middle job or profession. Approximately twenty-five percent of mothers thought that the child would actually achieve a level three type of job and around five percent saw their child as achieving a level four type job. Another five percent thought the child would actually achieve a level five type job, but no mother thought that her child would only achieve a level six job. Around nine percent of the mothers thought that the child would be a housewife only and twenty-five percent of mothers had no ideas as to what career the child would most likely pursue.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences found with any of the occupational or educational items.

2. Socioeconomic Status

A significantly larger proportion of upper-middle class mothers than upper-lower class mothers thought that their child would graduate from college. Conversely, more upper-lower class mothers thought that their child would quit school before going to college. Significantly more mothers of upper-lower class children (than those of the upper-middle class) aspired to level three type of jobs for their child. Significantly more upper-middle class mothers gave responses which were classified in one of the more rare categories and added together for purposes of chi-square analysis.

3. Sex

Significantly more mothers of male subjects than of female subjects thought that their child would actually graduate from college. Also, significantly more mothers of female subjects thought their child would not attend college at all, but would settle for a high school degree or less. The overall chi-square for the item indicating careers desired by the mother for the child was significant. Specifically, more mothers of males aspired to a level two type of job for their child, while more mothers of females aspired to a level three type of job for the child. Similar differences were observed in the responses to the items concerning the job that the child aspired to. That is, significantly more mothers of males thought that their child aspired to a level two type of job, while significantly more mothers of females thought their child aspired to a level three type job. In addition, significantly more mothers of females thought that their child would actually end up achieving a level three type job, than did the mothers of males. The overall chi-square for this occupational expectation item was also significant.

III. Nonacademic Activities

a. Description of Frequencies

With respect to extra-curricular activities, only one mother reported that her child engaged in no activities outside of school, while only two mothers reported that the child engaged in only one activity. Nine percent of the mothers reported two separate activities, while approximately twenty-seven percent mentioned three separate activities. Twenty percent of the mothers mentioned four separate activities and the remaining forty percent listed five or more separate activities in which the child engaged when not in school.

The mothers were then asked what sort of interactions or activities occurred between themselves and the child. Seven percent reported simple verbal interaction between mother and child with no explicit statement of positive affective feelings concerning such interaction. Fifty percent of the mothers described the interaction as consisting of primarily nonverbal joint activities (such as playing games or going to the movies) or simply described a positive affective interaction of a nonspecified nature ("We have fun together."). Thirty percent of the mothers described the interaction as consisting primarily of work-related or other constructive activities such as housecleaning or dish-washing. Only seven percent of the mothers described the interaction as being negatively toned, whether overt or covert in nature.

When further queried as to the exact nature of the mother-child interaction, forty-four percent of the mothers reported that their interactions revolved primarily around household activities, while only seven percent stated that the interaction was strictly conversational or verbal in nature. Nine percent reported recreational activities at home, whether indoors or outdoors, and mentioned assistance with the child's homework. Approximately twenty-eight percent of the mothers stated that the primary interaction consisted of activities participated in away from home such as religious activities, sporting events, and other outings. Only two of the mothers reported that they participated with the child in all activities outside of school, while nine percent denied interaction of any sort.

When asked to mention activities of a different nature other than the first-mentioned activities, sixty-eight percent either did not mention additional activity types or simply listed other interactions which were essentially of the same nature. When asked how many separate activities were engaged in by the mother and child together, again ten percent of the mothers reported no activities and thirty percent reported only one activity. Twenty-seven percent of the mothers reported two separate activities engaged in while thirty-three percent reported three or more activities.

The mothers were next asked about the nature and intensity of the child's interaction with the father. Sixty-three percent of the mothers reported that the father-child interaction consisted primarily of recreational activities which were not primarily verbal in nature or of non-specified positive affective interactions. Less than five percent of the mothers reported that the nature of the interaction was strictly verbal. Nineteen percent of the mothers reported that the primary father-child interaction concerned work or constructive activities engaged in together, while six percent reported either negative interactions or total lack of interaction. When asked to mention a second type of activity engaged in between father and child, almost eighty-five percent of the mothers either reiterated the same type of interaction or stated that there was no other type of father-child interaction present.

When asked about the exact nature of the father-child interaction, fifteen percent of the mothers described this interaction as primarily involving household activities such as shopping or gardening, while less than five percent described this interaction as being strictly verbal. Eleven percent described the interaction as involving either leisure activities around the home or as being related to the child's homework. Fifty-two percent of the mothers described the interaction as concerning activities engaged in away from home such as church-related activities or sporting events. Only two of the mothers reported that the father was involved with the child in all activities outside of school, while six percent reported a complete absence of interaction between father and child. Almost seventy percent of the mothers either did not mention a second type of activity engaged in between the father and child, or mentioned a second activity of the same type as that first mentioned. When questioned as to number of separate activities participated in by father and child, eleven percent reported no activities, while twenty-seven mentioned only one activity. Forty percent of the mothers listed two activities, while seventeen percent listed three or more separate activities.

In response to questions concerning activities in which the child engaged with the whole family, less than five percent of the mothers reported that there were no special activities where the child participated with the whole family, while another small proportion (three) mentioned that only in general conversational or mealtime activities did the child interact with the total family unit. Seven percent of the mothers stated that the child interacted with the whole family unit only for indoor leisure time activities such as television and game playing. Approximately eleven percent mentioned vacations as the primary family activity, while sixty-four percent mentioned outings of various natures as the type of activity most frequently engaged in by the total family unit.

When questioned concerning the child's affiliation with any clubs or organizations, approximately thirty-seven percent of the mothers stated that their child belonged to some organized group such as scouts, YMCA, or church groups. Twelve percent listed sports clubs or groups as the primary organization in which their child participated. Twenty-four percent of the mothers mentioned miscellaneous types of organized groups other than the two types mentioned above, while twenty-six percent stated that their child belonged to no organized group. When queried as to whether or not the child belonged to any additional groups, fifty-five percent of the mothers simply gave a repetition of their earlier response, either mentioning the same activity or an activity so similar as to be classified in the same general category. Around five percent who had not mentioned organized groups, such as Boy Scouts, mentioned this sort of group as the second response. Around eight percent who had not previously mentioned sports listed sporting activities as the second response, while twenty-five percent mentioned miscellaneous other varieties of organizations.

In response to questioning concerning individual hobbies or classes, thirty percent mentioned cultural pursuits such as music or art. No mothers mentioned special academic pursuits, and fifteen percent mentioned individual sports activities. Eighteen percent mentioned special hobbies of a somewhat intellectual nature, and nine percent mentioned domestic or vocational special interests such as cooking, typing, or raising pets. Twenty-six percent of the mothers said that the child had no special hobbies or individual interests. When asked whether or not the child had any additional interests or hobbies, sixty-four percent of the mothers did not name any additional activities, while another seven percent mentioned a similar or identical interest to that which was first mentioned. Seven percent of the mothers mentioned cultural areas as a second interest, ten percent mentioned sports interests, four percent mentioned hobbies of an intellectual nature, and eight percent mentioned non-intellectual recreational interests (cooking, pets, and so forth).

The mothers in the subsample were asked about the child's chores or jobs which he performed in the family context. As a first mentioned chore, nine percent of the mothers named bed-making, and sixteen percent mentioned dishwashing. Approximately forty-one percent of the mothers mentioned general housecleaning, while nine percent mentioned miscellaneous chores around the house which could not be classified in any of the above categories. Twenty-four percent of the mothers mentioned chores which were performed outside the house such as washing the car or gardening. No mothers stated that the child performed no chores whatsoever. Upon being asked about additional chores aside from the originally mentioned one, five percent then mentioned bed-making, twenty percent mentioned dishwashing, thirty percent mentioned general housecleaning, nineteen percent miscellaneous chores around the house and seventeen percent mentioned chores performed outside the house. Only five percent of the mothers said that the child was responsible for his personal items only. Twenty-nine percent said that the child was responsible for family chores only, while the remaining sixty-six percent of mothers stated that the child was responsible for both personal items and family chores.

The mothers were then asked the reasons for assigning chores to the child. Sixteen percent answered that the primary reason was to help out the parents, and nine percent stressed the duty aspect of doing chores. Approximately thirty-three percent of the mothers assigned chores to teach the child responsibility. Another fifteen percent of the mothers stressed the fact that various skills were acquired through doing chores while an additional sixteen percent indicated that this was a way of sharing and cooperating with the family. Only one mother indicated that the chores were done because the child actually wanted to do them, while less than five percent indicated that this was a method of keeping the child occupied and out of trouble.

Twelve percent of the mothers indicated that they constantly had to remind their child of his chores, while sixteen percent indicated that they frequently had to remind their children of their chores. Twenty-two percent of the mothers said that they sometimes had to remind their child of his chores, and thirty-eight percent indicated that it was seldom necessary to remind the child of his chores. Only ten percent of the mothers indicated that it was never necessary to remind the child of his chores. When asked whether or not the child ever tried to get others to perform his tasks for him, fifty-two percent of the mothers either gave an unqualified negative reply or indicated that their child would not enlist the aid of others for special reasons. Thirty-five percent indicated that the child attempted to enlist the aid of siblings, while one mother indicated that the child attempted to enlist the aid of the parents. Around six percent indicated that the child sought to enlist the aid of individuals who were not family members.

When asked how well the child performed his chores, approximately nineteen percent of the mothers indicated that his performance was excellent, while another thirty-seven percent indicated that the child's performance was good. Approximately thirty-seven percent more of the mothers indicated that performance was just satisfactory, while only five percent indicated that the child's performance was poor or very poor.

Less than five percent of the mothers indicated that their child always helped around the house without being asked, while twenty-one percent indicated that the child frequently (not not always) did so.

Approximately forty percent of the mothers said that the child sometimes helped without being asked, and twenty-four percent indicated that the child seldom helped without being asked. Around twelve percent said that the child never helped without being asked.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

A significantly larger number of mothers of ten-year-olds mentioned as a second response when asked about activities engaged in with the father, an activity so similar to the first mentioned activity that it was classified in the same category as the first mentioned activity. This suggests that ten-year-old children engage in a narrower range of activities with the father than do fourteen-year-old children.

A significantly larger number of mothers of fourteen-year-olds than of ten-year-olds indicated that their child never asked others to help with his chores. There were no other significant age differences in nonacademic activities.

2. Socioeconomic Status

When asked about number of extra-curricular activities engaged in by the child, a significantly larger number of upper-middle class mothers than of upper-lower class mothers mentioned five or more activities. There were two significant social class differences observed in the responses to the item asking about special hobbies, classes or lessons. First, a far larger proportion of upper-middle class mothers mentioned cultural pursuits. Second, a significantly greater number of upper-lower class mothers indicated that their child had no hobbies, lessons or classes.

In discussing jobs or chores assigned to the child, far more upper-lower class mothers mentioned dishwashing first, while more upper-middle class mothers mentioned general housecleaning as the first chore assigned to the child. As a second response, more upper-middle mothers than upper-lower class mothers mentioned dishwashing. Significantly more upper-lower class mothers said that the child was responsible only for family chores, while significantly more upper-middle class mothers said that the child was responsible for both personal and family chores. There were no other social class differences observed.

3. Sex

In listing the number of extra-curricular activities participated in by the child, significantly more females than males were assigned to the combined category representing rare responses. This is primarily due to the fact that a larger number of females particpated in three or more activities, but the combined frequencies in each separate category did not reach the minimal theoretical expectation of ten (five per cell).

When asked about type of parent-child interactions, significantly more mothers of females mentioned that the primary interaction involved household activities such as shopping or gardening. Mothers also indicated that significantly more females than males engaged in one and only one activity with their father.

In response to the question concerning the child's membership in various clubs and organizations, significantly more mothers of females said that their child belonged to a miscellaneous group of organizations which were not scouts or related youth groups, or sports-related clubs. These were primarily religious, cultural and intellectual interest groups. Significantly more mothers of males reported that their child had a hobby which was "intellectual" in nature, such as collecting or building various models or photography.

When questioned about jobs or chores, significantly more mothers of males mentioned, as a first response, outdoor chores than did mothers of females. As a second response concerning chores, significantly more mothers of females mentioned dishwashing and other specified general house chores performed primarily indoors. Again, as a second response, more mothers of males mentioned chores performed outside the house. Significantly more mothers of males described the child's chores as being related to the general family only, while more mothers of females described the context of the chores as being both family-related and personal (taking care of own possessions and room). More mothers of females gave as a reason for the child having chores to teach various skills or qualities (other than general responsibility).

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked how the child responded to criticism when he was not doing something correctly, twenty-six percent of the mothers reported that the child accepted the criticisms or suggestions positively and tried to learn to do better. Fourteen percent of the mothers said that the child simply accepted the criticism in a neutral manner, while ten percent indicated that the child's acceptance was negative in nature. Approximately eleven percent of the mothers said that the child reacted in an emotional manner only, without specifically stating that he accepted the criticism, while nine percent reported that the child rationalized his poor performance. Around six percent of the mothers reported that the child either did not react at all or reported some unclassifiable reaction on the part of the child. Fourteen percent of the mothers reported that the child's reaction was situational and depended on the circumstances, while twelve percent gave irrelevant or inappropriate responses, or said that they did not know how their child reacted.

When asked how the child reacted to punishment of various sorts by the mother, thirty percent of the mothers indicated as a first response that the child took the punishment well, apologized, or discussed the situation with the parent. Only two mothers said that the child engaged in no overt action whatsoever, while twenty-seven percent indicated that the child either sulked or withdrew. Ten percent of the mothers described the child as crying or being depressed, while twelve percent described their child becoming angry or engaging in hostile physical or verbal behavior. An additional ten percent said that the child's reaction was situational and depended upon the specific nature of the punishment situation.

As a second response describing the child's reaction to punishment, sixteen percent of the mothers mentioned taking the punishment well, apologizing, or discussing the problem. Only one mother mentioned total lack of reaction and seven percent mentioned sulking or withdrawal behavior. Six percent of mothers described the child as becoming depressed or crying, while fourteen percent described the child as experiencing hostile affect or engaging in hostile physical or verbal behavior. Fifty-five percent of mothers gave unclassifiable answers as their second response, presumably due to mentioning only one reaction to punishment.

The mothers were then asked how the child reacted when criticized by them. Sixteen percent of the mothers said that the child took the criticism well, apologized, or discussed the situation with the mother. Only two mothers described the child as becoming quiet and engaging in no overt action, while approximately thirty-two percent described the child as becoming depressed or crying. Four percent of mothers said that the child either sulked or withdrew, and five percent described the child as becoming angry. Another seven percent of the mothers said that their child either laughed off the criticism or ignored it, and fifteen percent described the child as engaging in defensive or hostile verbal behavior. An additional seventeen percent of mothers described the child's reaction as situational depending on the nature of the criticism, and only one mother claimed to have never criticized the child.

When asked how the child reacted to punishment by the father, twenty-six percent of mothers said as a first response that the child took the punishment well, apologized, or discussed the situation with the father. Four percent described the child as engaging in no overt reaction, and twelve percent described the child as either sulking or engaging in withdrawal behavior. An additional thirteen percent described the child as either crying or experiencing depressive affect, and nine percent described the reaction as hostile affective, or as engaging in overt hostile verbal or physical behavior. Fifteen percent of mothers described the child's reaction to punishment by the father as situational, depending on the nature of the punishment, and the remaining twenty-three percent gave responses which were not classifiable for various reasons, among those being the responses describing fathers who did not punish the child.

As a second response describing the child's reaction to punishment by the father, around ten percent of mothers mentioned taking the punishment well, apologizing, or discussing the situation with the father. Around four percent mentioned sulking or withdrawal behavior, and only one mentioned depressive affect or crying. Around six percent of the mothers mentioned hostile affect or overt hostile verbal or nonverbal behavior, while around four percent described the reaction as situational. Around seventy-four percent of the mothers gave responses which were unclassifiable for various reasons.

The mothers were then asked how the child reacted to criticism by the father. Eleven percent described the child as taking the criticism well, apologizing, or discussing the problem with the father, while seven percent described the child as engaging in no overt action whatsoever. Twenty-five percent said that the child either cried or experienced depressive affect, and another six percent described the child as either sulking or withdrawing. An additional five percent of mothers said that the child became angry, and four percent said that he either laughed it off or ignored it. Nine percent described the child as engaging in defensive or hostile verbal behavior, and another fifteen percent said that the child's reaction was situational and depended upon the situation. Seven percent of mothers claimed that the father never criticized the child and the remaining ten percent of responses were unclassifiable.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

In describing the child's reaction to punishment by the father, significantly more ten-year-olds than fourteen-year-olds were described as crying or experiencing depressive affect. This was the only significant age difference.

2. Socioeconomic Status

In describing the child's reaction to punishment by the father, significantly more upper-middle class than upper-lower class children were described as taking the punishment well, apologizing, or discussing the situation with the father. This was the only social class difference.

3. Sex

In describing the second reaction of the child to punishment by the mother, significantly more mothers of females than of males gave responses which were unclassifiable or uncodable as a second reaction, presumably indicating that girls more frequently reacted in a single manner to punishment by the mother. This was the only significant sex difference observed.

V. Job Outside the Home

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked if the child had a regular job outside the home, thirty-nine percent said no, and approximately forty percent said yes and described some sort of common part-time job held by children. Six percent gave responses which were not classifiable but were relevant to the question, while seventeen percent gave responses which were not relevant or gave no information. Thirty-two percent of the mothers said that the child had positive feelings concerning his job, while only ten percent said that the child's attitude was neutral or negative.

When asked why the child worked, around thirty percent of the mothers gave economic reasons whether to help the family income or to supply money for the child's own use. Only around eight percent gave non-economic reasons such as enjoyment of the job by the child or parental pressure or encouragement (for non-economic reasons). The remainder of the responses were either inappropriate as the child did not work, or unclassifiable.

When asked how hard the child worked at his job, thirty-three percent of mothers described the child as hardworking or conscientious, while around five percent described the child as not working very hard at his job. The remainder of the responses were either inappropriate or unclassifiable.

When asked the child's reaction to problems or difficulties encountered on the job, around fifteen percent of mothers said that the child did not seek help, while around twenty-three percent said that the child did seek help when problems arose. Again, the remainder of the responses were unclassifiable or inappropriate.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

The mothers were first asked how the child reacted when criticized by his siblings or other children. Seven percent said that the child accepted the criticism positively, while ten percent said the child did not react in any manner or ignored the criticism. Approximately forty-nine percent of the mothers described the child as becoming mildly hostile or depressed, while four percent of mothers described the child either as withdrawing or taking a defensive stance such as exhibited by laughing or making "wise-cracks." Twenty-three percent of mothers indicated that their child reacted strongly either by verbal quarrels or physical fights.

When the mothers were asked for an evaluation of the success of the child's interpersonal relations, thirty-nine percent of the mothers stated that their children got along very well with other children, while forty-five percent reported that the child's interpersonal relations were average. Twelve percent of the mothers reported that their child's interpersonal relations were somewhat poor. Eighteen percent of the mothers reported that their child was assertive, bossy, or lost his temper in interpersonal relationship situations. Eight percent reported that their child was unassertive, shy or self-conscious in relationships with his peers. Approximately twenty percent of the mothers described their child as being gregarious and as changing friends frequently. Only two mothers described their child as being completely independent, while only five percent reported that the child had few or no friends. Another five percent reported that the child had a few close or long-term friends. Thirty-nine percent of the mothers had no information or gave irrelevant information concerning the nature of their child's interpersonal relations with his peers.

When asked about the influence of the child's friends upon him, twenty-six percent said that friends had no influence upon the child, while another five percent said that there was a general non-specified positive influence exerted by the friends. Approximately twenty-five percent reported that there was influence which was neither good nor bad. Six percent reported that there was a general negative influence exerted by the friends, while twenty-six percent reported specific negative influences such as hair fashions or social habits. Around thirteen percent of the mothers either had no information or irrelevant information regarding the influence of the friends.

When asked how the child reacted to having his feelings hurt, fourteen percent said that the child either ignored the situation or withdrew, while forty-five percent said that the child became depressed or anxious. Seventeen percent of mothers said that the child either experienced hostile affect or expressed verbal or physical aggression when his feelings were hurt. Approximately fifteen percent reported that the child either accepted the situation, thought about the problem, attempted to cope with the problem directly or requested help from other individuals; in other words, either coped actively or passively with the situation. Less than five percent reported that their child experienced a physiological reaction to such a situation, and only one mother reported that the child never had his feelings hurt. Around six percent reported a lack of information concerning the child's reaction to having his feelings hurt.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more upper-lower class mothers than upper-middle class mothers described their child's relationship with peers as being "average." This was the only significant social class difference in interpersonal relations.

3. Sex

There was a significant overall sex difference observed with respect to responses to the item describing the child's behavior in interpersonal situations. More mothers of girls described their child as being aggressive or self-assertive. More mothers of boys described their child as being shy or a "follower," and as being gregarious and changing friends frequently. Another sex difference involved the child's response to having his feelings hurt. Significantly more females than males reacted to this situation by experiencing depressive or anxious affect.

Significantly more females than males were described as reacting to criticism by siblings by a variety of rare responses which were combined into one single category. These responses involved both active and passive coping behavior and total absence of reaction, as well as ignoring the criticism or laughing it off. This suggests, then, that males more frequently engage in either mild or strong hostile reactions to criticism by siblings.

VII. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

In response to questioning concerning the child's reaction to being worried, thirty-three percent of the mothers said that the child talked to someone about the problem. Around seventeen percent said that the child's reaction was completely affective, whether depressive, anxious or hostile, or that he completely lost control of himself. Less than four percent of mothers described the child as attempting to cope with such a situation, while fifteen percent said that the child attempted to control himself or at least not display his feelings openly. Approximately fourteen percent of the mothers described the child as either withdrawing or as engaging in specific behaviors which are either overt or covert and of a physiological nature. Only two mothers described the child as not engaging in any affective or overt behavior and another five percent of the mothers claimed that their child did not worry, while an additional eleven percent did not have any information concerning their child's reaction to worry. When asked what sorts of things worried their child, around eleven percent mentioned either fear of some sort of physical harm or death (through war, physical health, or otherwise), or mentioned various institutional-related fears (such as political or religious). Approximately thirty-three percent of mothers mentioned academic problems such as school grades or homework as the primary source of worry. Another thirty-four percent of the mothers mentioned problems specifically related to youth such as peer relations, hair styles and clothes, or school athletic activities. Only one mother mentioned family problems such as money, but around eleven percent mentioned self-concerns such as the child's behavior, own faults, future plans, or being punished.

When asked whether or not the child turned to others for help when worried, around sixteen percent of the mothers said no. Around thirty percent of the mothers said that their child came to them for help, and another twenth-four percent said that the child either went to the father or to both parents. Six percent of the mothers mentioned attempts to receive help from family members other than the parents, such as siblings or grandparents. Approximately seventeen percent of mothers mentioned either unspecified aid sought or that aid was sought from various non-family members such as peers or a teacher.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences observed.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant socioeconomic status differences observed.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences observed.

VIII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

In response to queries concerning sources of anger in the child, fifty-nine percent of the mothers mentioned petty annoyances and minor grievances inflicted upon him by others (usually siblings or peers). These were the type of annoyances to which practically all children are constantly exposed. Ten percent of the mothers mentioned "major" or more serious grievances such as people's immoral or unethical behavior toward the subject or being accused unjustly of some act. Twenty-one percent mentioned control of the child's behavior by parents and other authority figures as the primary source of anger. Only one mother mentioned the child's own behavior (whether academically-related or not) as the primary source of his anger, and two mentioned the mistreatment of other people as the source of anger. Again only two mothers mentioned the abstract behavior or attributes of others (not directed toward the child), and another two mothers claimed that the child never or seldom became angry.

In response to questioning concerning the child's behavior when angry, eleven percent of the mothers described the child as withdrawing. An additional fourteen percent said that the child experienced hostile affect only without engaging in any overt behavior. Only three mothers said that their child attempted to cope with the situation either actively or by controlling the overt expression of his anger. Thirty-nine percent of the mothers said that the child engaged in verbal hostility when angry, while an additional ten percent said that the child became depressed or anxious. Six percent stated that the child engaged in physical aggression, and only two mothers described the reaction as purely physiological in nature. Less than four percent of mothers said that the child engaged in no affective or overt behavior when angry, while two parents said that the child sought help when he was angry. Nine percent of the mothers claimed either that they did not know the nature of the child's behavior when angry, or that he never became angry. The mothers were then asked what the child did in response to anger toward the mother herself. Approximately twenty-five percent said that their child withdrew in such situations, while only five percent described the child as attempting to cope with the problem either actively or by controlling the anger or acceptance of the blame. Ten percent said that the child became depressed or anxious in such situations, while twelve percent described the child's reaction as hostile affective with no accompanying overt action. Less than four percent of mothers described the child as engaging in no overt action or as experiencing any affective behavior. Thirty percent of the mothers said that the child engaged in verbal aggression toward them, and another five percent described the child as engaging in overt rebellious behavior. Around five percent of mothers either did not know their child's reaction or claimed that the child was never angry with them.

The mothers were then asked how the child responded when angry with the father. Twenty-three percent said that the child withdrew when angry with the father, while around five percent said that the child attempted to control the expression of his anger. Eight percent described the child as experiencing either depressive or anxious affect, while six percent described the child's reaction as hostile affective in nature. Eleven percent of mothers said that the child engaged in no affective or overt behavior in the face of such a situation. Twenty-three percent described the child's reaction as verbal aggression, but less than four percent said that the child engaged in overt behavioral rebellion. Only one parent described the child as attempting to resolve the misunderstanding with the father, and one other mother reported that the child passively accepted the situation.

When questioned as to the child's reaction to a friend being angry with him, approximately twenty percent of the mothers indicated that the child either accepted the anger or initiated behavior designed to resolve the difficulty or misunderstanding. Ten percent of mothers reported that the child did nothing in the face of such a situation, while fourteen percent reported that the child either experienced hostile affect or engaged in some sort of hostile overt behavior (whether verbal or physical). An additional fourteen percent reported that the child either withdrew from such a situation or found other friends to play with. Around nine percent of the mothers reported that the child became depressed in the face of such a situation. Almost twenty-one percent of the mothers reported that they did not know what the child did when his friend was angry with him.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences in the responses to items concerning the child's aggressive behavior.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant social class differences in the aggression items.

3. Sex

Significantly more males than females were described as becoming angry at a variety of things classified in small frequency categories and combined for purposes of analysis. This combined category is primarily defined by the category for major or serious grievances. Thus, one might safely say that males more frequently mention major sources of anger while females mention the more common and minor sources of anger. There were no other significant sex differences.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When mothers were asked to estimate how well their children were doing in school, seventy-five percent did not respond with any direct indication of how satisfied they were with their child's school performance. Eleven percent indicated that they were satisfied with their child's school achievement, while fourteen percent indicated dissatisfaction with the achievement in school.

When asked as to any meeting or interaction the mother had had with the child's teacher, twenty-one percent said that they had never met the child's teacher. Less than four percent indicated that they had met the teacher, but did not indicate in what context. Only two mothers reported that they had met the teacher at the school's specific request or general invitation for such a meeting, while fifty-four percent reported meeting the teacher only on formal occasions, such as PTA or during some program produced by the school. Ten percent of mothers indicated that they had met the teacher through their own iniative by becoming involved in some school activity such as serving as an officer in PTA or by acting as a room-mother. An additional seven percent of mothers also initiated the interactions with the teacher on an informal basis such as occasionally dropping by to discuss the child's schoolwork.

When asked whether or not they did anything specific to encourage the child in his schoolwork, fifteen percent of the mothers reported that they did nothing. Twenty-one percent reported that they gave either unspecified aid, or that they helped the child with his homework only. An additional twenty percent reported encouraging the child through the use of academically supportive actions (such as special classes, tutors) or academically enriching actions (such as acquiring encyclopedias or museum visits). Thirty-two percent of the mothers reported that their primary encouragement was by attempting to foster the right attitudes and build up academic interests oriented toward present performance or future performance (such as jobs or college). Fourteen percent of mothers gave responses which were classified as (a) use of positive or negative reinforcement, or (b) various material supports for the child's schoolwork such as a quiet room or paper and pencils.

When asked what was done to see that the child did his homework, eleven percent of mothers reported that they did nothing and did not qualify this response. Seventeen percent also said that they did nothing but qualified the statement by indicating that it was not necessary for them to do anything. An additional eight percent said that it was not necessary for them to do anything due to others (father, siblings) having the primary responsibility for seeing that the child did his homework, or due to external pressures such as detention in school. Forty-three percent of the mothers reported using verbal reminders to see that the child did his homework. This category included mothers who only occasionally had to remind the child as well as those who had to remind continuously. Only five percent of the mothers reported that they watched the child do his work or checked the work to see that it was correct. Around ten percent reported that they either (a) actively helped the child in doing his homework, or (b) used various positive and negative reinforcements to see that the work got done.

The mothers were asked what they felt the school's primary responsibility to be. Some mothers gave up to three responses. For the first response, twelve percent mentioned either specific subject matter, or general liberal arts or cultural matters. Fifty-six percent mentioned education or teaching in general. Approximately eleven percent mentioned the necessity to see that the child understood the subject. Less than four percent of mothers mentioned preparation for the future, such as college or careers, while around fourteen percent mentioned either (a) what was not the school's responsibility, or (b) that the school's responsibility should be somewhat limited. As a second response, less than four percent of the mothers mentioned specific school subjects or general culture, and only two mothers mentioned education in general. Around twenty-four percent mentioned the responsibility to instill certain values or morals, to maintain or teach discipline, individual guidance or development, or character and personality growth. About five percent of the mothers mentioned schoolwork related responsibilities such as seeing that the work is done and helping children to understand the subject. Another seven percent mentioned preparation for the future as a second responsibility, while nineteen percent listed what the school should not do, or mentioned that restriction of the school's responsibility was desirable. Forty percent of the mothers gave no useable information after the first response. As a third response, fourteen percent of the mothers mentioned general instilling of values, morals, and personality and character formation, while ten percent mentioned the limitations of the school's responsibility. Seventy-two percent of the mothers gave no further codable information.

When asked how important they felt school to be, thirty-four percent felt that it was the most important aspect of the child's life, while sixty percent felt that it was very important, but not the most important aspect. Around four percent felt that school was of average importance, and only one mother felt that it was unimportant. When asked why school was important, approximately thirty percent of the mothers mentioned future jobs, careers, or socioeconomic reasons in general. Less than four percent mentioned academic reasons such as present achievement or future education, while twenty percent mentioned either personal or social development of the child. Almost thirty-nine percent mentioned a global or general preparation for life as the reason for the school's being important.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

A significantly larger number of mothers of fourteen-year-olds than ten-year-olds' mothers said that they had never met the child's teacher. Significantly more mothers of ten-year-olds gave responses which were classified into a combined category of somewhat rare responses. This category is defined primarily by parent-initiated meeting of the teacher, whether on a formal basis by being involved with the school, or on an informal basis such as dropping by to talk to the teacher about the child's schoolwork. In addition, there were significantly more mothers of fourteen-year-olds than of ten-year-olds who felt that school was the most important aspect of the child's life. There was also a significant overall age chi-square value to the item asking why the school was felt to be important. In addition, there was one significant category: more mothers of fourteen-year-olds than of ten-year-olds indicated that the school was important primarily for purposes of personal and social development. These were the only significant age difference.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more upper-lower class mothers than upper-middle class mothers gave no direct indication of their degree of satisfaction with the child's schoolwork. Significantly more upper-middle than upper-lower class mothers indicated dissatisfaction with the child's school achievement. There were significantly more upper-lower class than upper-middle class mothers who had not met their child's teacher. Significantly more upper-lower class than upper-middle class mothers indicated that they encouraged the child in his schoolwork by either (a) use of positive and negative reinforcement, or (b) by providing material supports such as paper or a quiet room. In response to the question concerning why school was considered important, significantly more upper-lower class than upper-middle class mothers mentioned jobs or socioeconomic reasons specifically, while significantly more upper-middle class mothers mentioned general preparation for life as the primary importance of school. The overall chi-square for this item was also significant.

3. Sex

There were no significant sex differences observed.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

When the mothers were asked how they proceeded to get their child to perform a certain task, eight percent said that they either simply presented the task or gave the child a rational explanation for performing the task. Forty-five percent said that a mild or polite request was made of the child, while fourteen percent said that strong request was necessary. Thirty percent of the mothers said that a direct order or demand, or threat of punishment was necessary in order to get the child to perform the task. When asked what follow-up, if any, was necessary to see that the child performed the task, seventeen percent said that nothing was done, either because the parent abdicated responsibility or because it was unnecessary. Forty-four percent said that it was necessary either to remind the child or explain to him why he should do it, while twenty-one percent reported that either constant reminding or a strong emotional appeal was necessary. Seven percent of the mothers mentioned the use of positive or negative reinforcements.

When the mothers were asked what they did when they saw that the child was doing something incorrectly, eight percent claimed that this situation never arose. Fifty percent said they then explained or demonstrated the correct manner of performing the task, while twenty-one percent maintained a certain standard of performance with respect to the child so that the child was forced to either figure out the correct way or do it over again. Only five percent of the mothers indicated that they would react with verbal hostility or aggression toward the child, while nine percent said that they would either punish the child or perform the task themselves.

When the mother was asked how she usually disciplined or punished her child, five percent indicated that this never happened. Twelve percent used discussion or praise as a means of discipline while fifteen percent used mild verbal behavior. Only three mothers resorted to strong verbal behavior or threats. Thirty-seven percent deprived the child of privileges, while eighteen percent confined him either to his room or to the house. Ten percent used physical punishment.

When the mother was asked how the father punished the child, eleven percent indicated that the father never punished or disciplined, Thirteen percent used discussion or praise, while fifteen percent used mild verbal methods. Ten percent used strong verbal means or threats. Sixteen percent and eleven percent respectively deprived the child of privileges or movement and thirteen percent used physical punishment.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences found with the authority items.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more upper-middle class than upper-lower class mothers said, as a follow-up to see that the child performed his task, that a simple reminder or an explanation of why the task should be performed was the method used. This was the only social class difference observed.

3. Sex

When asked how they went about getting the child to perform a task, more mothers of males indicated that it was necessary to use a strong request than did the mothers of females. This was the only significant sex difference observed.

III Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked what was done to help the child get along with other children, twenty-three percent of the mothers said that they did nothing, while another twenty-three percent said that the only thing that they did was to encourage social activity. Another twenty-three percent of the mothers said that they used various positive training methods to encourage interpersonal relations, while seven percent indicated that they utilized various negative approaches or reinforcements to discourage certain traits detrimental to good relations with peers. Approximately twenty-five percent of mothers indicated that they attempted to help the child by a variety of methods either unspecified or utilizing both positive and negative approaches.

b. Significant Differences

There were no significant age, social class, or sex differences observed with this variable.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked what the mother did when the child was worried, twenty-five percent indicated that the child was given emotional support, told to seek religious solace, or encouraged to engage in some activity which would serve to reduce tension. Twenty percent of the mothers indicated that they advised the child to take direct action such as going to the source of the problem and attempting to resolve it. Six percent of mothers advised the child to simply accept the situation, while twenty-eight percent gave ambiguous responses indicating that their advice depended upon the specific situation over which the child was worried. Six percent of mothers said that they gave no advice. The remainder of the mothers gave information that either was not classifiable, gave no information, or claimed that the child never worried.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences.

3. Sex

The overall chi-square value for this item was significant. In addition, the chi-square value for the category encompassing ambiguous responses was significant. A far greater proportion of mothers of females gave these ambiguous responses or responses indicating that their advice was situation-specific.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When the mothers were asked if they had taken any courses or training since leaving school, forty-eight percent said that they had not. Approximately thirty percent said that they had either taken professional, vocational, or technical work, or intellectual courses which could lead to a degree. Less than four percent indicated that they had taken short-term intellectually oriented courses such as a literature or language class, and around seven percent indicated that they had taken recreational courses such as flower arranging or some other interest or hobby oriented course. An additional four percent indicated that they had taken a course related to domestic areas such as cooking or sewing, while another seven percent had taken service oriented courses such as first aid.

When asked why such courses were taken, twenty-five percent of mothers indicated economic reasons, while seven percent indicated either personal or social usefulness or desire to help the family. Eight percent of the mothers indicated that the main reason was for self-improvement, and another eight percent indicated personal satisfaction or distraction ("to get out of the house") as their main reason. The remaining fifty-one percent of the mothers either gave unclassifiable responses or no information.

When asked how long ago they had taken the courses, eleven percent indicated that they had taken them shortly after finishing school or over ten years ago, eleven percent said they had taken them between five and ten years ago, while fifteen percent said they had taken them within the last four years, or were currently taking courses. Eight percent of the mothers said that they had taken courses over a long period of time, some being completed some time ago and others either currently or a short time ago. Fifty-four percent gave responses which were either unclassifiable or the item was inappropriate as no courses had been taken. When asked whether or not the courses had been completed, five percent said they had never completed any of the courses. Approximately five percent also said that they had completed some, but not all, of the courses, while forty percent said they had completed all of the courses they had taken. The remainder had either taken no courses or gave responses which were unclassifiable.

When asked whether or not they felt they had gained anything from these courses, none of the mothers said that they had not, and fifty percent said that they had gained something. The remainder had either not taken courses or their responses were inappropriate or unclassifiable.

b. Significant Differences

There were no significant age, socioeconomic status, or sex differences observed.

II. Occupational Aspects

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked why the mother was working, five percent said that it was because they enjoyed this type of work or wanted to work in that area. Another five percent indicated that convenience was the main reason, such as convenient hours or location, while eight percent mentioned external factors such as a previous accident or other reasons for changing work. Four percent indicated either family pressures or specific financial returns as their reason for having their current job, and another four percent mentioned the influence of friends as their reason for occupying their present job. Around eighteen percent of the mothers said that they had no particular reason for having the job but had simply drifted into it or had applied for the first job available to them. The remaining fifty-one percent either were not working or gave unclassifiable responses.

When asked what their current job was like, around twenty-eight percent gave purely descriptive responses indicating the nature of the job, while around fifteen percent gave evaluative responses either positive or negative in nature. For the remainder of the mothers this item was not appropriate.

The mothers were then specifically asked how well they liked their job. Forty percent indicated that they liked their job, two mothers indicated neutral or ambivalent feelings, and only three indicated negative feelings toward the job. When asked what about the job they liked, only one mother said that the job was interesting, three mothers mentioned variety, one mother mentioned the money, three mentioned that it was a chance to get ahead, one mentioned the ability to be independent, and ten (thirteen percent) mentioned being able to be with pleasant associates.

When asked what aspect of the job they disliked the most, one mother mentioned boredom, three mentioned poor working conditions, one mentioned the inability to be independent, three mentioned disliking their associates, one mentioned feeling a lack of accomplishment, and ten (twelve percent) mentioned aspects specific to the exact nature of the job in question.

The mothers were then asked if they would choose the same type of work if they could choose again. Six percent said that they would not choose that type of work, while thirty-four percent said that they would choose the same sort of work. Seven percent gave conditional or uncertain responses to this question, and for the remainder, the question was inappropriate.

When asked what they did about problems that arose on the job, twenty percent said that they attempted to solve the problems themselves. Six percent said they would first attempt to solve it by themselves and then seek help if not successful. Fourteen percent said that they would immediately seek help from their co-workers or supervisors or others away from the job. Only one mother mentioned withdrawal or an affective reaction in response to problems on the job, and two mothers denied that there were ever any problems which arose at work. For the remainder of the mothers, the question was either inappropriate or the responses were unclassifiable.

When asked their opinion as to the best way to get along with co-workers, five percent indicated that the question did not apply as they worked alone. Approximately eleven percent said that doing all of one's own work was the best method for getting along, while four percent said that ignoring the co-workers was the best method. Fifteen percent said that being sociable or friendly was the best method, and ten percent said that being tolerant of others was the preferred method. For the remainder of the mothers, the question was inappropriate.

When asked how best to get along with bosses or supervisors, six percent again indicated that they worked alone. Thirty-three percent said doing one's work properly was the best method, while less than four percent mentioned that doing more than one's share was the best method. Only one mother mentioned respect as the key to getting along with the boss, while one other mother mentioned flattery. For the remainder of the mothers, the question was not appropriate.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Significantly more upper-middle class than upper-lower class mothers did not work, and listed their only occupation as housewife. Thus, significantly more upper-lower class than upper-middle class mothers gave responses classified in one of the categories describing various reasons for acquiring the job currently held. When asked what the job was like, significantly more upper-lower class than upper-middle class mothers gave purely descriptive responses without evaluating the job. When specifically asked how well they like their job, significantly more upper-lower than upper-middle class mothers gave positive evaluations of the job. Both of these significant differences are biased by the fact that more upper-lower class mothers work. The significant differences observed with the item concerning what is liked most about the job are also biased due to this factor so that significantly more upper-middle class mothers give responses indicative of the fact that they do not work, while more upper-lower class mothers give a variety of reasons for liking the work which are combined into a single category. Exactly the same situation holds for the responses to the item asking the mothers what they dislike the most about the work. The same bias is found with the item asking whether or not the mothers would choose the same type of work, given a second chance. That is, the only significant difference is found with the category assigned to responses where the mother does not work. The same bias also appears with the items concerning how best to get along with co-workers, and with bosses and supervisors.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked what was their reaction to general criticism, thirty percent of the mothers gave conditional responses and a rational analysis of the situation, or they engaged in rational verbal interaction with those who criticized them. Seventeen percent of the mothers said that they took the criticism well or laughed it off and another five percent said that they ignored all criticism. Thirty-three percent of the mothers indicated that they became depressed or anxious when criticized or that they took criticism poorly, and ten percent said that they got mad, argued, or made excuses to the person who criticized them.

The mothers were then asked to describe their reactions when specifically criticized by their husbands. Twenty percent indicated that they utilized either cognitive rational analysis or rational verbal interaction with the husband. Twenty-one percent indicated that they either took it well or laughed it off, while five percent indicated that they simply ignored such criticism. Twenty-one percent of the mothers said that they reacted with negative (depressed or anxious) affect or took criticism very poorly, while seventeen percent mentioned anger or defensive verbal behavior as their primary reaction. Less than four percent said that they were never criticized by their husbands and the remaining fourteen percent gave unclassifiable responses or no information.

When asked how they reacted to criticism by friends, twenty-one percent mentioned either rational analysis or rational verbal interaction, while around twenty-two percent said that they took it well or laughed it off. Approximately fifteen percent claimed to ignore criticism by friends, while ten percent indicated negative affective reactions or taking the criticism very poorly. Six percent said that they became angry or engaged in defensive verbal behavior and fifteen percent claimed that they were never criticized by their friends.

When asked how they reacted to criticism by their children, fifteen percent mentioned rational analysis and conditional responses. Twenty-eight percent said that they took it well, while thirteen percent indicated that they ignored such criticism. Fourteen percent of the mothers indicated negative depressive or anxious affect as their reaction, and no mother said that she reacted with humor or laughed it off. Approximately five percent said that they engaged in defensive verbal behavior, and eight percent said that they engaged in rational verbal behavior with the child. Only one mother mentioned a hostile affective reaction, and eleven percent claimed that they were never criticized by their child.

The mothers were then asked what sorts of things made them angry. Approximately twenty-seven percent mentioned petty annoyances of the type that the majority of individuals are constantly exposed to, while fourteen percent mentioned others' treatment of them of a more serious or long-lasting nature (such as cruelty, being cheated or lied to or being unjustly accused of some action). Less than four percent mentioned sources of anger originating with the self or one's own poor performance, but twenty-eight percent mentioned their child or children as the primary source of anger. Six percent mentioned the mistreatment of other people as the main source of anger, and approximately nineteen percent mentioned annoying behavior of others (not directed toward the subject) whether impersonal others, groups, the husband, or co-workers. Only one mother claimed to never become angry, and the remainder gave unclassifiable responses.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant differences in this area.

2. Socioeconomic Status

There were no significant differences involving socioeconomic status.

3. Sex

There were no significant differences in this area.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

Ten out of the thirty-six possible correlations were significant, all of them positive. The most striking relationship was that between Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and every Task Achievement (Academic) variable, i.e., Coping Effectiveness, Initiation, Attitude, Persistence and Engagement assessed on two different questions in the interview schedule.

Engagement also was correlated with Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area. Attitude correlated with Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) when the level was defined as the number of organized groups belonged to. Attitude also was correlated with Activity Level when it was defined as the number of hobbies. Persistence was correlated with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

Three out of the thirty possible correlations were significant, all of them positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and Persistence was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized both by the mother and the father.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Two out of the thirty correlations were significant, both of them positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) assessed on two different questions in the interview was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

One out of the eighteen possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Three out of the twenty-four correlations were significant, all of them positive. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general, while Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

One out of the fifteen possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Five correlations out of a possible twenty were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with both mother and father. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by both mother and father was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

Two correlations were significant out of a possible twelve. Coping

Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall twenty-seven out of a possible two hundred seventy-five correlations were significant, all of them positive.

Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) had the most significant correlations with other variables, seven in all. Initiation was correlated with Coping Effectiveness, Initiation, Attitude, Persistence and Engagement assessed by two different questions in the Task Achievement (Academic) area. It also was correlated with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Three variables had no significant correlations with any other variable. They were Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations when criticized by other children and Coping Effectiveness and Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

Four out of the eighteen possible correlations were significant, two negative and two positive. Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in the Task Achievement (Academic) area were correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement, while Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Initiation in Contacting school.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

One correlation out of the twelve was significant. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

Two out of the twelve correlations were significant, both of them negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) assessed on two different questions was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

There was one significant correlation out of eighteen. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Parental Attitude toward importance of school.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

Two out of the fifteen possible correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively with Parental Academic Aspiration, while Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother was correlated positively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

Three out of the ten correlations were significant, two positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by father and by mother was correlated positively with reason for the child having a job around the house, development of the child's personality receiving a high score; while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Authority x School - Table 24

Two correlations out of the fifteen were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated positively and Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated negatively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

Two out of the nine correlations were significant, both of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt was correlated negatively with parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement and Parental Initiation in Contacting School.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

One out of the four possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

One out of the six correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated negatively with parental attitude toward importance of school.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

Two out of the twelve correlations were significant, both of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and with the father was correlated with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

One out of the eight correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother was correlated negatively with reason for the child having a job around the house, child's personality development receiving a high score.

Aggression x School - Table 33

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall twenty-two out of two hundred eight correlations were significant, ten of them negative and twelve of them positive.

Parental Occupational Aspiration and Parental Academic Aspiration had most correlations with other variables. Both had five.

Academic Aspiration was correlated with Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in the Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and Coping Effectiveness when angry with father and with mother. All correlations were positive.

Occupational Aspiration was correlated positively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) and negatively with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) as assessed on two different questions, negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father and negatively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

Quite a large number of variables had no significant correlations with other variables. Twelve were in the Child Behavior area and two in the Parent Attitude area. The Child Behavior variables were Attitude, Engagement and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) defined as number of groups belonged to and also as number of hobbies, Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother, Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children, Implementation in the Anxiety area and Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with a friend.

The variables in the Parent Attitude area both related to parent's concept of the major function of school.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

Four out of the twelve correlations were significant, all of them negative. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Schoolwork, while Engagement assessed on two different questions and Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) all were correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in Homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

Two correlations were significant, both of them negative. Coping Effectiveness and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).*

*See scaling manual for correct interpretation.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

Three out of the thirty correlations were significant, all of them positive. Coping Effectiveness and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) were correlated with Positive Affect father-child interaction, while Attitude toward Task Achievement (Academic) was correlated positively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

One out of the twelve possible correlations was significant. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated with Degree of Guidance by parents.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

One out of a possible thirty correlations was significant. Activity Level defined as number of hobbies was correlated positively with Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

One out of the six possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

Two correlations were significant out of a possible ten, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother was correlated negatively with parental implementation in homework, while Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated positively with the same variable.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

Three out of the ten possible correlations were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother was correlated negatively both with Parental Directedness* and Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area.

*See scaling manual.

Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father was correlated with Parental Directedness* only.

Authority x Interpresonal Relations - Table 44

Only one out of the twenty-five correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father was correlated with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

One out of the six correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

One out of the three possible correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in the Anxiety area.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

One correlation out of four was significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area was correlated with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

Two out of the ten correlations were significant, both of them negative. Implementation in Anxiety was correlated negatively with

---

*See scaling manual.

Activity Level father-child interaction and Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

There were no significant correlations.

There were no significant correlations for Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic), Table 54, for Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Table 55, or for Aggression x Interpersonal Relations, Table 56.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

One out of the six correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends was correlated with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area.

Summary

Overall twenty-four out of two hundred thirty-five correlations were significant, fifteen negative and nine positive.

Two variables had five correlations with the other variables. These were Parental Implementation in Homework and Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Parental Implementation was correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father, negatively with Engagement assessed on two different questions and Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Parental Directedness was correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by both father and mother and Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by other children.

Ten variables did not correlate with any other variable. Eight of these were in the Child Behavior area and two in the Parent Treatment of Child area. The Child Behavior variables were Activity Level and Initiation assessed on two questions in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother, Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children and Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with father and with mother.

The Parent Treatment of Child variables were Activity Level mother-child interaction and Degree of Guidance given by parents in Interpersonal Relations.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

Three correlations out of a possible twenty-four were significant, two negative and one positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated negatively with child's Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), while mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated negatively with child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) and positively with child's Persistence.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

Six correlations out of a possible twenty-four were significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general was correlated positively with child's Activity Level defined as number of organized groups belonged to and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated positively with Activity Level defined both as number of organized groups belonged to and as number of hobbies, with Coping Effectiveness and with Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

Two correlations out of a possible twenty were significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children was correlated positively both with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and when criticized by father.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There was one significant correlation out of eight, the mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlating negatively with child's Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

One correlation out of a possible sixteen was significant, mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children correlating positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There was one significant correlation out of five. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area was correlated positively with Activity Level as defined by number of hobbies.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

There was one significant correlation out of four mother's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression correlating positively with child's Coping Effectiveness in the same area.

Summary

Overall sixteen out of one hundred thirty correlations were significant, three of them negative and thirteen of them positive.

Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her children had the largest number of correlations with other variables, seven in all. It was correlated positively with Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), with Activity Level both defined as number of organized groups belonged to and as number of hobbies, Initiation and Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area, with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and when criticized by the father and with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Thirteen variables, all in the Child Behavior area, had no significant correlations with variables in the Parent Behavior area.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There were no significant correlations.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There was one significant correlation out of a possible twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated positively with Parental Initiation in contacting school.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

There were two significant correlations, one negative and one positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the husband was correlated positively with child's reason for having a job around the house.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only three out of a possible forty correlations were significant, one negative and two positive. Eight out of the thirteen variables had no significant correlations with other variables. Five of these were Parent Attitude variables and three Parent Behavior variables.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There was one significant correlation out of a possible eight.

Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated positively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

There was one significant correlation out of a possible twenty. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband was correlated negatively with Activity Level father-child interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There was one significant correlation out of five, mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlating negatively with Degree of Parental Guidance in the Anxiety area.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations. Aggression had no significant correlations either with Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Table 82, Interpersonal Relations, Table 83, or Anxiety, Table 84.

Summary

Three out of a possible fifty correlations were significant, two negative and one positive. Eleven of the variables had no significant correlations, eight of them in the Parent Treatment of Child area and three in the Parent Behavior area.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

Two correlations out of a possible nine were significant, one of them positive and one of them negative. Parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated positively with Parental conception of the major function of school while Parental Initiation in contacting school was correlated negatively with the same variable.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

The only significant correlations came in the Task Achievement (Academic) x School matrix.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

There were no significant correlation.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There was one significant correlation out of a possible ten. Parental Implementation of Homework was correlated positively with Activity Level mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

One out of the two possible correlations was significant, Parental Implementation of Schoolwork correlating positively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There were two significant correlations out of a possible ten. Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) was correlated both with Activity Level and Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Four out of a possible thirty-three correlations were significant, two negative and two positive. Three variables had no significant correlations. They were Positive Affect mother-child interaction, Degree of Guidance by parents in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area and Degree of Parental Guidance in Interpersonal Relations.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

One correlation out of a possible fifteen was significant. Parent's satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement was correlated negatively with Positive Affect mother-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

There was one significant correlation out of a possible four. Parental Occupational Aspiration was correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of Schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

Two correlations out of a possible four were significant, one of them positive and one of them negative. The reason for the child having a job around the house was correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and positively with Degree of Guidance by Parents in the same area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

There was one significant correlation out of a possible ten, reason for the child having a job around the house correlating positively with Positive Affect father-child interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There was one significant correlation out of a possible six. Parental Attitude toward importance of school was correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance given by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were no significant correlations.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Overall six out of a possible eighty correlations were significant, four negative and two positive. Nine variables had no significant correlation. Four of them were in the Parent Attitude area and five in the Parent Treatment of Child area.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Description of the Sample

The mothers and fathers agreed very closely in their descriptions of the family composition. Moreover, they were very similar as to birthplace, age distribution, and amount of education. They agreed closely in describing their children's health histories and, indeed, on all of the descriptions of family characteristics covered by the first twenty-two questions in the interview.

Child Relevant and Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

The mothers and fathers, as groups, agreed almost completely in the way they distributed their ratings of their children's academic achievement and feelings about school. In explaining why the child feels as he does about school, however, twice as many fathers as mothers attributed it to the child's recognizing schooling as a way to improve himself or get ahead in life. A third of the fathers selected this explanation.

Both sets of parents agreed closely in describing things they did to encourage the child in his schoolwork. As might be expected, twice as large a percentage of fathers (almost forty-five percent) had never met the child's teacher.

In discussing how the child reacted to homework, twice as many fathers as mothers (over fifty percent) reported that the child seldom had any. This discrepancy probably means that the fathers simply paid the subject less attention and were less well informed than the mothers. Both sets of parents agreed closely, however, in describing the child's style of coping with homework when it is clear that he has some to do. They agreed to a great extent that neither of them found it necessary to do anything to get the child to do his homework, in most cases. They also agreed that most of their children tended to procrastinate a good deal before getting at their homework. Obviously, both mother and father felt this was normal, did not see it interfering with eventual completion of the homework, and consequently seldom saw a need to intervene. The overwhelming majority of both parents reported that if the child found he had been doing his homework the wrong way he would start over to do it right, whether or not it made him feel annoyed or unhappy. Clearly, these parents in Austin feel that they can leave their children to their own resources, or to guidance from the school, where homework is concerned.

Mothers and fathers agreed closely about the nature of the school's responsibility and mission, most seeing it as a matter of providing a general education, first of all, with the instilling of culture and the liberal arts as an important secondary theme. Both mothers and fathers then gave specific mention to the school's role in helping the child learn to get along with other people and to give him some active guidance in this direction, as in teaching him good manners. Literally no parents thought to describe the school's main responsibility as preparation for college or preparation for an adult vocation. Vocational preparation rather clearly is something these parents see taking place apart from formal schooling, somehow, although presumably they would say, if asked, that the attitudes and work habits they expect the school to instill would be a necessary foundation for adult work (see below). Perhaps they think of job skills as something that will, and should be, learned on the job; or perhaps only in senior high school, if they are to be taught in school at all.

It may be noted that this pattern appeared in the replies of mothers in all countries. Everywhere, parents viewed the school's two primary functions as intellectual training and training in desirable forms of social behavior.

Fathers and mothers agreed that school is either the most important part of a child's life (about thirty-five percent said this) or a very important part (another sixty percent). Only one mother and no fathers described it as "unimportant." The reasons they gave for its importance were closely similar, too. The greatest weight was given to its contribution to children's social development; next, to its usefulness for betting better jobs or making more money; and, finally, its importance in the child's personal development toward a happy, self-respecting life. The practical utility of education for economic advancement did emerge here; although still not as a matter of training in vocational skills, specifically.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

Mothers and fathers had about the same aspirations and expectations for their children's education. The vast majority (seventy-five percent of fathers and eighty-five percent of mothers) hoped their child would graduate from college. What is more, sixty-three percent of the fathers and seventy-one percent of the mothers expected that this would happen. An additional fifteen percent, in each case, thought their child would get at least some college-level training. This is not surprising at the upper-middle class level, of course; but, considering the inclusion of the skilled worker sample, it speaks forcefully of the universality with which college has come to be viewed as almost an automatic expectation for the vast majority of American youth.

When asked to describe the future careers they would like to see their children pursue, mothers and fathers agreed to a large extent. About half of the parents, including some from both socioeconomic levels, hoped their children would have middle-class kinds of jobs. A sizable proportion of both mothers and fathers, however (thirty-seven percent and thirty-three percent, respectively), were willing for the child to pursue any career he might choose, any career that would fulfill his life, or "anything decent or moral." Only about five percent of parents had no preference at all, or had not thought about it. Both sets of parents had similar views about the kinds of careers they would not want for their children: notably, low-status or morally questionable jobs. They were in close agreement, too, in their view of their children's career aspirations and of their children's probable, eventual careers.

III. Nonacademic Task Achievement

Mothers and fathers largely described the amount of their children's out-of-school activities in similar tones; but a considerably higher proportion of fathers (thirty percent as compared to eleven percent of the mothers) named only two or three activities. Most mothers, probably through greater familiarity with their children's use of time, named a larger number of activities. The particular activities described by both mothers and fathers were similar. The one difference was that fathers reported a somewhat larger number of activities the child shared with them than did the mothers in describing activities the father and child shared. Both parents had substantially the same view of the child's participation in organized groups, such as church youth groups, sport clubs, neighborhood "gangs," and the like; and they described the children's hobbies in similar terms.

Both parents agreed in describing the jobs or chores the child performs at home. There was one difference in describing the reasons for giving the child such duties. Twice as many fathers (thirty-five percent) as mothers (fifteen percent) saw it as a way for the child to learn useful skills or qualities (apart from "learning to be responsible," which was a different category). No differences appeared in the amount of supervision the parents reported. Mothers tended to be a little more conservative than fathers in evaluating how well the child did his chores.

Curiously, in talking about whether the child has regular work outside the house, many mothers and fathers did not agree. Sixty percent of the fathers said the child did not, whereas only thirty-eight percent of the mothers said this. Conversely, a simple "yes," without further information, was given by forty percent of the mothers and only twenty percent of the fathers. Either these mothers and fathers have a different conception of "a regular, outside job"; or the mothers are better informed about how their children spend their time out of school. In any case, both parents tended to agree on how their children feel about such jobs as they may have, why the child is working, and how hard and self-reliantly he works at it.

IV. Authority

When asked how they go about getting the child to do something, both mothers and fathers overwhelmingly selected either "a rational explanation" or "ask him; and then tell him if asking doesn't work." Only three mothers and no fathers said that they simply "tell him" or otherwise give a flat order. No parent admitted making threats of punishment. (No parents did in any country, which would represent something of a millenium in child-rearing if one did not suspect a strong social-desirability influence on these parental self-descriptions.) It does appear highly significant, nonetheless, that the tradition of "spare the rod and spoil the child" is no longer acceptable to parents as a public description of their philosophy--and practice--of child-rearing (whatever some of them may practice, in private).

What is more, mothers and fathers agreed strongly that their children most often respond positively to this parental direction. Indeed, the majority of both parents reported no need for parental follow-up to see that the child did as he was asked. The only discrepancy was that twelve percent of mothers but only one father reported the child responding to parental correction in a purely emotional way, without actually following that correction.

Whether or not it is entirely true, in fact, more than twice as many fathers as mothers (thirty-three percent versus twelve percent) reported that their primary way of disciplining or punishing their child was to discuss the situation with him and explain why it would be best for him to act as he was asked to do. The fathers tended, in general, to report using positive rewards more often than the mothers, and threats or strong verbal disapproval less often. They also reported much less often than the mothers that the child reacts by getting angry, grumbling, withdrawing or showing no reaction. It would be worth careful study to find out if this happy state of affairs does actually obtain among these fathers and children; and, if so, whether it is because the fathers actually do behave more rationally and positively or because they simply leave the difficult parts of child-disciplining largely to the mothers.

Some clue may be found in the fact that when the mothers described the fathers' style of discipline, they depicted "rational discussion" only half as often as did the fathers (fifteen percent versus thirty percent). Furthermore, ten percent of mothers, as opposed to no fathers, described the father as scolding or otherwise expressing moderate disapproval. While somewhat more fathers than mothers (twenty-seven percent versus sixteen percent) reported the father resorted to severe "bawling out," a great many more mothers than fathers (thirty-seven percent versus fifteen percent) described the father as using serious threats or as depriving the child of privileges or of freedom to move around. It would seem, if the mothers' reports are accurate, that the fathers are not quite such paragons of calm reasonableness as they make themselves out to be--possibly, in all sincerity.

In describing how the child reacts to the father's discipline, there were some further discrepancies between the mothers' and fathers' views of the facts. Fathers, more often than mothers, reported that the child accepted the father's correction in a good spirit.

In describing the child's reaction to criticism from his mother, the mothers reported simply "quiet listening" much more often than did the fathers, who tended more often to say that the child "got angry" at the mother. This appears to be a general mental set among the fathers, since they also reported much less often that the child "listened quietly" to criticism from the father; and they reported more often than did the mothers that the child reacted with anger to the father's criticism. Thus, according to the fathers, their children get angry and do not listen to criticism, much more often than the mothers report, whether the criticism originated with the father or the mother. Conversely, the mothers saw their children tending to listen more and get angry less. Possibly, the mothers tend to elicit anger less often than do the fathers.

V. Interpersonal Relations

When asked to describe the child's relations with other children, mothers tended to use a wider scale of evaluation. About thirty-seven percent said "excellent"; another forty-five percent put it about average; and the other eighteen percent said "not very well." By contrast, sixty-seven percent of the fathers put it at "average"; twenty-seven percent, "excellent"; and only five percent, "not very well." Probably, the mothers' descriptions were a good deal better informed and more accurate than the fathers'. The fathers were more likely than the mothers to describe the child's social life as consisting of "one or two close friends," rather than describe the child's individual style of social behavior, whether "assertive," "gregarious," "independent," "changeable," or other specifically descriptive terms which many of the mothers used.

Mothers and fathers talked similarly, however, about what they did to help the child get along with other children, how they saw peers influencing him, and how they felt about the peer influence. On the whole, they either were approving or conditionally approving, or they liked their child's independence of any excessive peer-group influence. Only twelve percent of mothers and ten percent of fathers actively disliked the influence of agemates on their child.

In identifying what a child should learn as he is growing up, fifty percent of the mothers named learning to respect and get along with people as the first priority. Only half as many fathers chose this.

Both mothers and fathers reported essentially the same picture of their children's reactions to criticisms from other children.

VI. Anxiety

Mothers and fathers expressed essentially the same view of what worries their children, how the children cope with anxiety and how they manifest it. The great majority of parents named the war and physical health as the things their children worry about.

VII. Aggression

Parents also agreed quite closely in citing the things that make the children angry and how the children handle their anger. In most cases, they reported the child withdrew or tried to resolve the difficulty by talking it over.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

After leaving school, considerably more fathers than mothers had taken additional training, most notably in professional or vocational skills. Their reasons were different, too. Fathers much more often took further training in order to improve their vocational skills and earn more money, while mothers most often did it to add to useful personal skills or to increase their helpfulness to the family. The women's training tended to be spread over a longer period of time, with relatively fewer completed courses than were finished by the men. Substantially more men (seventy-two percent) than women (fifty-one percent), felt they had gained from the additional education.

II. Occupational Aspects

A much larger percentage of men (thirty-three percent) than women (ten percent) said they had actively chosen the kind of career they were pursuing. Of course, the majority of the mothers were full-time homemakers (fifty-three percent). The great majority of the mothers who worked, and of the fathers, said they liked their work (eighty-seven percent and eighty percent, respectively). Only eight percent of the working mothers and one father said that they disliked their jobs. In telling what they liked about their jobs, somewhat contrary to expectation, many more men than women singled out the factor of having nice people to work with (fifty-five percent of the men, compared to thirty-three percent of the working women). The working women more often named some feature of the work they did as the major source of their satisfaction. When discussing the things they did not like about their work, on the other hand, the men more often (fifty-five percent) named a particular feature of the work than the working wives (twelve percent). The women more often said they disliked nothing about their jobs (fourteen percent versus five percent of the men).

Only twenty percent of the men and twelve percent of the working mothers said they would not choose the same kind of work if they had it to do over. More of the men (twenty-eight percent), however, were uncertain or conditional in their attitude, compared with the fifteen percent of the working mothers who took this stance. Thus, the women tended to have many fewer reservations about their work than did the almost-half of the men who had from mild to strong reservations.

When asked how they dealt with problems that arose in their daily work (now including the homemakers), far more women than men (fifty-seven percent versus twenty percent) said they turned for help to their spouse or to a friend away from the job. Twice as many men (forty percent) as women (twenty percent) said they solved such problems by themselves.

As for "the best way to get along with the boss," seventy-four percent of the working mothers and fifty-two percent of the men said, "do your work well" or words to that effect. Another twenty-eight percent of the men reported that the question did not apply, since they worked by themselves.

III. Personal Characteristics

In describing their own reactions to criticism, in general, the mothers and fathers displayed no significant differences, although the men tended to report analyzing the criticism rationally, more often (forty-eight percent versus thirty percent of the women). The women more often discussed their feelings, whether "taking it well" (seventeen percent versus seven percent of the men) or "getting hurt or depressed" (thirty-five percent versus seventeen percent of the men). When criticized by their spouse, more of the men claimed to react with a rational analysis than did the women (forty-two versus twenty percent). The same kind of difference was reported in reaction to criticism from friends; and more women reported "ignoring it" (fifteen percent versus ten percent) or defensively countering the criticism verbally (seventeen percent versus two percent of the men). Still in the same vein, a larger proportion of fathers than mothers (thirty-five versus fourteen percent) claimed to react by rationally analyzing criticisms from their own children.

The mothers reported that when they got angry, it was far more often over petty annoyances (twenty-eight percent) than in the case of the fathers' reports (two percent). More of the fathers said they got angry about someone mistreating another person, or an animal. Once angered, there was no difference in the way mothers and fathers acted, as they reported it. The two most frequent reactions were either to express the anger vocally or try to calm down or not show the anger.

IV. Occupational Values

The mothers and fathers, as groups, agreed quite closely with each other in their ranking of the Occupational Values. The only significant difference occurred on the item about Following the Father's Occupation. Seventy-six percent of the mothers, but only fifty-four percent of the fathers gave this a rank among the top three of the fifteen items; and the rest of the fathers scattered the item farther down the scale than did the mothers.

JAPAN

INTRODUCTION

This is a brief review of the educational situations, the parents' educational concerns, and the sampling method of interviewed parents which may be needed for the understanding of Japanese interview data.

Educational Situations and Parents' Educational Concerns in Japan

In Japan where social mobility is great, what decides the future of children is, first of all, their school career. That is, if someone receives only compulsory education, it is an unfavorable condition to him while graduation from a well-reputated university means very much for him. Therefore, even the parents of lower social status want to send their children to college and/or university, though they themselves could not receive higher education. Thus, some characteristic features appear concerning Japanese education. Firstly, what is important is not the academic abilities children get in university, but the diploma they get there. The situation is not different even in case of girls, either. That is, if a girl has a poor academic career, she is handicapped in finding a mate who has a brilliant future prospect. Now, most universities confer diplomas to their students as long as they stay there for a required number of years and pay their tuition, no matter whether they study hard or not. Therefore, what parents aim at is nothing but to send their children to a well-reputated university. In order to achieve this aim, they have to send their children to an upper secondary school which successfully sends many of its graduates to well-known universities. Then, in order to enter a well-reputated upper secondary school, their children must be in a well-known lower secondary school, many of whose graduates go to a well-reputated upper secondary school. Every time children enter a higher level of school, they have to go through a highly competitive entrance examination. In order to have children pass the exam, a tremendous amount of preparatory education is given, which often makes them sacrifice the development of their character, health, sociability, and creativity. This is done even at the age of kindergarten in its extreme cases. One could say it is desperately done all over Japan.

Such defect, tragedy, or disgrace of Japanese education has certainly given many ill effects to several aspects of our society. Yet, the parents and the whole society must recognize the existence of the system. Needless to say, there is much criticism of it, and many reform plans have been proposed. As this is a problem, however, where the interests of various kinds of people are entangled with each other, reform campaigns have always resulted in going halfway and being ineffective. In other words, it may be said that our society still approves the existence of the system, though there are many complaints about it as well.

What parents request of teachers may be easily understood from the previous statements. That is, they ask teachers to assist their children and have them successfully enter a well-reputated school of higher level. On the side of the school, teachers well know the parents' desire and usually try to cooperate with them. Nevertheless, not a small number of teachers maintain noble, humanistic ideals. But there are many barriers which restrict their efforts to put their ideals into practice.

Sampling Method

First, each of the eight subgroups studied in the First Stage was divided into good and poor groups by pupil's academic achievement. As all the sample pupils of both ages in Japan had been given the mathematics test and the Japanese language test made by the Ministry of Education, each pupil's scores of the two tests were added together and the medium of the composite scores was obtained for each subgroup. Before the scores of the two tests were added, the scores were converted so that the full score would be the same in both tests. Thus, at the obtained medium point, each subgroup was split into two groups concerning pupils' academic achievement. From each of thus-obtained sixteen subgroups, five pupils were random-sampled and their mothers were interviewed. That is, eighty pupils, ten percent of the eight hundred Stage I sample pupils, were sampled and their mothers were made the sample for the mother's interview. Then the fathers of the half of the sampled pupils were also made the sample for the father's interview. When fathers were sampled, in Subgroup One three fathers were taken out of the five whose children were good academic achievers and two out of the five whose children were poor academic achievers while in Subgroup Two, two were taken from good achievers and three from poor ones. This procedure was repeated in each set of Subgroups Three and Four, Five and Six, and Seven and Eight.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - CHI-SQUARE REPORT

To begin with, it must be noted that no generalization can be made from the following figures, as our subjects were not sampled, with equal probability, from all ages, and especially not from all the social classes.

Description of the Sample

Among eighty sample pupils, those who lived only with their parents were fifty-six percent and those who lived with their relatives as well as parents were thirty-three percent. Most of the relatives they lived with were their grandparents. Those who lived with their parents and non-relatives were eleven percent. The non-relatives were employees and roomers.

Eighty-nine percent of the sample pupils were taken care of by their mothers and eleven percent mentioned both parents. No one was taken care of by any other person than his or her parent. Regarding this matter, no significant difference was found by age, class, or sex.

As for mother's birthplace, the percentage of mothers born in the prefectures not adjacent to Tokyo, that is, far from Tokyo, was the largest (fifty-one percent). Next to it was the percentage of mothers (thirty-nine percent) who had been born in some other ward of Tokyo. The percentage of those born in other places than those mentioned above was very small. No significant difference was found by pupil's age and sex. When examined by social class, thirty-eight percent of the upper-lower had been born in the prefectures distant from Tokyo while sixty-five percent of the upper-middle belonged to the same category. It means that the women who had been born in the provinces, yet wealthy and with a high level of schooling, had gathered in Tokyo. As for father's birthplace, the number of the fathers who had been born in the prefectures not adjacent to Tokyo was the greatest (forty-three percent). Next to it was the number of those born in other wards of Tokyo (thirty-nine percent). Though the general features of the mothers and the fathers were similar in this respect, the men's mobility seems a bit less than the women's. No significant difference was observed on any of the three variables. Therefore, it may be considered that the class difference observed among mothers did not exist among fathers. It shows that, in case of men, those of lower class as well as of higher class come to Tokyo or are absorbed there as labor force.

With regard to mother's age, the percentage of those in the age range thirty-five to thirty-nine was the largest (thirty-six percent). The second was the forty to forty-four (thirty percent). Needless to say the difference by child's age was significant. The percentage of the mothers in the thirty-five to thirty-nine group was larger among the ten-year-old children (fifty percent) than the fourteen-year-old children (twenty-three percent). Naturally, no sex difference was found. When it came to social class, however, the percentage of the mothers in the forty-five to forty-nine group was twenty-five percent among the upper-lower and significantly larger than the comparable percentage (five percent) of the upper-middle. It may be that the higher their socioeconomic status, the lower the age at which women cease child-bearing. As for father's age, the percentage of fathers in the forty to forty-four age range was thirty-eight percent, comprising the largest group. The thirty-nine-or-under, and the forty-five to forty-nine were the second largest, their percentage being nineteen percent each. Naturally the difference by child's age was significant. Fourteen out of forty fathers (thirty-five percent) were in the thirty-nine-or under among the ten-year-olds while only one father (2.5 percent) was in the same age range among the fourteen-year-old. Though it is natural that no difference by child's sex was observed, no class difference was noticed, either. Fathers were different from mothers in this respect.

For mother's occupation, the mothers with no work other than housekeeping were seventy percent, which is a reasonable figure in the social situation of Japan. They were followed by those engaging in the fourth-level occupations, skilled and/or organized workers and lower clerical workers, their percentage being sixteen percent. Then the third-level occupations followed, which include semi-professional workers and owners of small enterprise. They were six percent of all the mothers. No difference was observed either by child's age or sex. Class difference, however, existed though its existence is the natural result of the principle by which the subjects were sampled. That is, among the upper-lower class mothers, thirty percent were engaged in the fourth-level occupations while only one of the upper-middle class mothers was in the fourth level. Those without any paid occupation were fifty-eight percent of the upper-lower while the equivalent percentage of the upper-middle was eighty-three percent.

With regard to father's occupation, the largest number of fathers belonged to the fourth-level occupations (forty-four percent). The second largest group were those engaging in the second-level (thirty-four percent) which includes professional persons and office workers of big business. The first level, managerial and highly professional, were fifteen percent. Regarding these three levels, the class difference was distinct, while no age or sex difference was noticed.

As for mother's education, the percentage of the mothers who had middle-school education in the old system or upper secondary education (general course) in the new system was the largest or forty-eight percent. It was followed by the graduates of upper elementary school in the old system and lower secondary school in the new system, their percentage being twenty-five percent. On the other hand, the college and university graduates were only three percent. Here again, no difference was noticed by child's age or sex, yet class difference was naturally remarkable, especially in regard to the first two levels mentioned above.

When it came to father's education, the number of college and university graduates was the largest. Its percentage was thirty-four percent, a somewhat surprising figure. This is due to the rapid increase of the college and university enrollment which was effected by the establishment of a large number of colleges and universities in correspondence to the social need in the postwar Japan. The second largest was the number of graduates from upper elementary school in the old system and lower secondary school in the new system, the percentage being twenty percent. Then the graduates from higher school and professional college in the old system and junior college in the new system were eighteen percent and those from vocational middle school of the old system and vocational upper secondary school of the new system were sixteen percent. Here again no difference was noticed by age or sex. On the other hand, class difference was significant in most levels of school.

The general tendency of residence was rather stable. That is, forty-nine percent or nearly half of them had occupied their residence for fifteen years or longer. Thirteen percent had occupied eleven to fourteen years. Those who had lived in their house for five or six years and those for one to two years were respectively ten percent. No significant difference was noticed by any of the three demographic variables. The same tendency was found in the frequency of the children's change of residence in their past ten or fourteen years of living. That is, fifty percent of them had never moved, and twenty-six percent had only moved once. Though the geographical mobility of Japanese people is large, they seem to get rather settled around the age when they bring up their children. There were only three cases of the unusual situation where the children had ever been away from their home, that is, separated from their parents for six months or longer. They are only four percent of the sample.

When asked about the sample pupil's experience of hospitalization, seventy-six percent of the mothers denied it. Those who had been once hospitalized were twenty-one percent, and there were only two who were hospitalized twice. Even when hospitalized, the period of hospitalization was rather short, four to seven days and sixteen to thirty days were the only categories where any noticeable percentage (respectively five percent of the eighty children in each case) was found. The unusual occasion where one or both parents had ever been away from their home for six months or more was found in sixteen percent of the sample. In all these cases, the father was the one who was away. No difference by age, class, or sex was found in these items.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked to describe their child in terms of schoolwork, sixteen percent replied in terms of positive achievement, forty-three percent in neutral terms, while fifteen percent replied in terms of negative or poor achievement. Though these figures are noteworthy, the mothers may have avoided clear statement or tried to be humble or modest as is always the case of Japanese women. It may be also that those mothers' level of expectation was so high as to make their evaluation rather strict. When asked about their children's attitude toward school, fifty-nine percent of the mothers replied that their children were positively oriented to it. Some of these replies might have been noncommital, as were the twenty-one percent of neutral responses. There were very few strong positive (six percent) or negative (four percent) replies.

In reply to the question "How do you think he does in school?" sixty-one percent of the mothers replied in terms of behavior rather than performance, e.g., "he cooperates well." The percentage giving other replies ranged from three percent to thirteen percent.

The responses to this question also influenced the rating of satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with the child's schoolwork resulting in eighty-nine percent expressing neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction. When asked about children's attitude toward home assignment, the mothers' replies have become quite definite and clear, much different from their replies to the previous questions. Though forty percent of them did not say when their children did their homework, those who told that their children did it willingly and those who replied that their children did it at a certain definite time were each respectively twenty-two and a half percent. These two groups added together, forty-five percent of the mothers were replying that their children had an affirmative and positive attitude toward homework. As there was only one mother who gave a negative answer, it may be said that the children's attitude toward homework looked good in their mothers' eyes. When viewed by their mothers, the children's way of coping with their homework was most often self-initiative (thirty-nine percent). It may be, however, well showing the real fact. The inference is also endorsed by the mothers' responses to Item Thirty-Two. According to the mothers' judgment, thirty-four percent of the children seldom put off homework, and nineteen percent never did. That is, the number of children who took it seriously was much larger than the number of those who did not. The same positive tendency in study was also noticed in the fact that, when asked what their children would do if they were nearly finished with their homework and found that they had been doing it the wrong way, fifty-four percent or over half of the mothers replied that their children would spontaneously start it over without being swayed by their emotion.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

A tendency was noticed for the mothers of the fourteen-year-olds to less frequently answer about the time when their children do their homework than those of the ten-year-olds. It may indicate that, when children get as old as fourteen years, their mothers are not closely concerned with their homework.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The mothers who acknowledged their children's positive achievements in schoolwork were twenty-eight percent in the upper-middle class while they were three percent in the upper-lower class, and the difference was highly significant. On other items, no significant difference was noticed.

3. Sex

No difference of statistical significant worth describing here was noticed.

c. Summary and Interpretation

As it is often experienced by many investigators, reliable answers are obtainable from parents and/or teachers when they are asked about some facts. When they are asked their value judgment, as is the case in the above part of the present report, we must be especially deliberate in the interpretation of their replies. That is why much interpretation was added in the above description of frequencies. Overall interpretation, therefore, is omitted here.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

a. Description of Frequencies

The special features of the sample, especially that they were taken from only two social classes, upper-middle and upper-lower, had much affect on the findings of this section.

When asked the level of school they wanted to send their children to sixty-six percent of the mothers replied "as far as to college." Though the percentage includes those wishful responses accompanied with the conditioning clause of "if the situation permits," it must be still considered a very large percentage. Next to it was "as far as to upper secondary school, general (i.e., non-vocational) course," its percentage being twenty percent. On the other hand, when asked their realistic expectation, sixty percent replied "as far as to college," which is followed by the twenty-six percent expecting "as far as upper secondary school, general course." Though the centroid was moved a bit toward lower level, yet it is surprising that over half of the mothers, including those of lower classes, not only aspired to send their children as far as college, but also considered it possible.

Regarding mothers' aspiration for their children's future occupation, the percentage of the mothers aspiring for a third-level job was the largest (twenty-four percent), which was followed by the fifteen percent who were aspiring for a second-level job. Then, thirteen percent left it to the child's own preference, ten percent had no preference, and nine percent aspired for a first-level job. On the other hand, the type of occupations the mothers least liked to see their children take up were immoral or illegal jobs (twenty-nine percent) and particular jobs (fourteen percent). The mothers who replied that they did not care or had no occupation they especially disliked were twenty-six percent. When asked the type of work they considered their children, themselves, would like to do regardless of their mother's likes and dislikes, fifteen percent of the mothers stated that their children wanted to get in a first-level occupation, and another fifteen percent also named a second-level occupation. There were twenty-four percent of the mothers who mentioned a third-level job, and those who mentioned a fourth, fifth, or sixth-level job were eleven percent altogether. In view of the nature of the sample, these figures are quite understandable. There were also eight percent of the mothers who had no preference, another eight percent who did not know their children's aspirations, and nineteen percent who gave the answers classified under the category of "others." Then, when asked what occupation they thought their children would actually have, the first-level was five percent, the second-level was fifteen percent, the third-level was thirty percent, the fourth through the sixth levels were eight percent. Thus, the center of gravity moved downward, and "no preference" and "don't know" together increased to twenty-four percent. These results seem to be quite natural.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

The mothers of the fourteen-year-olds may be in the situation where they have to think about their children's future more seriously than the mothers of ten-year-olds. Probably due to this difference, the former's replies were more definite than those of the latter. That is, the mothers of the fourteen-year-olds showed significantly larger figures (thirty percent) than those of the ten-year-olds (thirteen percent) in the third-level occupations, which the largest number of the whole sample named as the work they wanted their children to do in their future. As for the least desired occupation, the former also exceeded the latter (twenty-three percent versus five percent) in the category of "particular profession" while the latter had a higher figure than the former in "no preference" regarding the expected future occupations of their children (thirty-eight percent versus ten percent). No significant difference was found elsewhere.

2. Socioeconomic Status

As for mothers' aspiration for their children's education, the upper-middle (ninety percent) significantly exceeded the upper-lower (forty-three percent) in the category of "as far as college," while the latter exceeded the former in "as far as upper secondary school" (thirty-five percent versus five percent). Of their realistic expectation on their children's actual schooling, significant differences were noticed in the same direction as above. As for the children's occupational aspirations viewed by their mothers, more children of the upper-middle class aspired for a first-level occupation than those of the upper-lower class. No significant difference was found in any other categories nor in any other items.

3. Sex

With regard to educational aspiration, more mothers of boys (ninety percent) replied "as far as college" than mothers of girls (forty-three percent), while the latter exceeded the former in their replies of "as far as upper secondary school" (five versus thirty-five percent). The same differences were noticed regarding their expectation on actual schooling. As for the aspiration for children's future occupation, more mothers of the girls aspired for a third-level job than mothers of the boys (thirty-eight versus ten percent). That is, mothers aspired more for clerical or semi-professional work for their daughters than they didfor their sons. As for the occupations they do not want their children to engage in, the boys' mothers more frequently named a particular profession than the girls' mothers (twenty-three percent versus five percent), while the latter named an immoral or illegal occupation more often (forty-eight percent versus ten percent). This is natural, as many replies classified under the last category referred to a gay trade. As for the children's occupational aspirations viewed by their mothers, the boys' mothers exceeded the girls' in first-level occupations (twenty-eight percent versus three percent), while the latter exceeded the former in the third-level, which corresponds to the above-mentioned mothers' aspiration. As for the mothers' realistic expectation, more mothers of the girls expected the third-level jobs than the boys' (forty-five percent versus fifteen percent). This finding is also consistent with the two findings already described above.

c. Summary and Interpretation

This group of mothers, including those of lower class, have a surprisingly high aspiration for their children's education. It is caused by the fact that Japan is a highly competitive society and the diploma of college graduation is a decisively favorable condition in obtaining a position not socially low. In the mothers' aspiration as well as expectation of their children's occupation, "no preference" and "don't know" amounted to unexpectedly large percentages. It may be, in a sense, indirectly reflecting the large mobility existing in Japanese society. It is indeed difficult for the mothers to have any clear prospect. Such interpretation will be endorsed by the fact that class difference is only exceptionally noticed regarding occupational aspiration, though it does exist.

III. Nonacademic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

The mothers reported that most children were engaged in two kinds (thirty-four percent) or three kinds (thirty-five percent) of activity when they were not in school. The value of such data may be, however, questionable.

As for activities carried on with their mothers, forty-four percent of the children had nonverbal activities with positive affect. Thirty-one percent had constructive ones, and nineteen percent had activities with negative affect. As for activities carried on with their fathers, fifty-five percent had nonverbal activities with positive affect, twenty-five percent had negative affect or lacked in interaction, and ten percent had constructive activities. When type of activity was looked at there were differences among those carried out with the mother and those carried out with the father. Thirty-four percent of the mother-child activities were related to work around the house while only five percent of father-child activities came in this category. Twenty-three percent of father-child activities involved outings while only five percent of mother-child activities involved this type of behavior. The closest similarity occurred on indoor activities including homework with thirty-six percent of the fathers and twenty-eight percent of the mothers being involved.

The main activities carried on with other family members were "watching television" (thirty-five percent) and "visiting with relatives or family friends" (fourteen percent), and thirteen percent lacked in interaction with them. As for the membership in some groups outside of school, eighty-three percent, an overwhelmingly large percentage, did not belong to any group, which is quite consistent with out daily observation. Even when we asked with such general terms as "any group," only sixteen percent gave an affirmative answer, and beside them only one child belonged to a sport club. These results reflect the Japanese situation where very few organizations of this nature exist for children. On the contrary, the learning of academic subjects, arts, or skills from a private teacher is prevalent. That is, thirty-five percent received lessons of cultural nature, thirty-one percent received supplementary lessons in academic subjects, sixteen percent learned skills for housekeeping such as cooking or sewing, and even those who learned sports from a private teacher were as many as eight percent. In doing house-chores, "general help" had the largest percentage (forty-six percent) and many other chores were also listed. But the detailed information will be omitted, as this kind of data is of little use. When asked the reason why the children did house-chores, thirty-eight percent of the mothers simply replied that the work "had to be done," which may be a real fact. Therefore, in reply to whether it was necessary to check up on the children's work, thirty-one percent of the mothers said "never," which was followed by twenty-nine percent answering "seldom." When asked if their children tried to make other people do what they had to do, fifty-four percent or over half of the mothers denied it. "Asks his (or her) parent" was the second most frequent reply which was given by twenty-five percent. As for the mother's evaluation on the way the children did their work, "excellent" was fifteen percent, "good" was twenty-nine percent, "satisfactory" was forty-six percent, and only five percent of the mothers gave a negative reply. Considering the Japanese mother's usual attitude or manner to make a rather modest evaluation on this kind of matter, it seems the children are doing rather well. When asked if they helped around the house without being asked, however, they did not seem to be filled with a strong spirit of service. That is, thirty-four percent responded "sometimes," "seldom" twenty-five percent, "frequently" sixteen percent, and "never" nineteen percent.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

No significant difference upon which any meaningful discussion can be made was found.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The upper-middle exceeded the upper-lower in receiving private lessons of cultural nature while the latter exceeded in learning domestic skills. As for the necessity of follow-up to see that the child did his (or her) work, the upper-lower class answered "always" more often than the upper-middle. In child's getting others to do his (or her) work for him (or her), the upper-lower had more replies of "no." That is, the children of lower class were less dependent on others in their work, and the upper-middle children depended on their mothers more often than the upper-lower children, although the lower-class children's way of doing their work was rather sloppy. No other differences observed were significant.

3. Sex

More girls than boys had constructive and household activities with their mothers, which may be a reflection of Japanese custom that girls help around the house more than boys. As for the activities engaged in with their fathers, girls made more replies of "absence of interaction" and "no activities," and as for going out with their family, the boys exceeded the girls. No significant difference was noticed elsewhere.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The life of Japanese children seems to be with their family and peer group which was not intentionally organized with a certain purpose but rather spontaneously emerged. They do house-chores rather well, probably due to the tradition to consider a child's help with house-chores for granted. Especially girls serve their mothers very much while they seem to be rather alienated from their fathers.

IV. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

The children's reaction to the advice given by parent when they were not doing a job the right way showed neutral acceptance was thirty-four percent. The percentages of both positive and negative responses were rather small. "Situational" was twenty-six percent, and "no reaction" was as much as nine percent. As for the response to the punishment given by mother, desirable responses such as "obedient acceptance" or "talking on it" were thirty-one percent, and undesirable responses such as negative and rebellious ones were altogether only fifteen percent. No conclusion can be made, however, as "other responses" amounted to forty-four percent. When punished by father, thirty-three percent showed desirable responses, while sixteen percent showed undesirable responses, which means the effect of father's punishment is about the same with that of mother's. As other responses also amounted to fifty-six percent here, it is not possible to make any decisive conclusions here either. When the same classification was applied to their reactions to their mothers' criticisms, "desirable" was twenty-five percent, "undesirable" forty-three percent, but "situational" and "other responses" was thirty-one percent. As for their reactions to their fathers' criticisms, "desirable" was thirty-three percent, "undesirable" thirty-nine percent, and "situational" and "no criticism given by father" were fourteen percent, respectively.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

No significant difference was noticed.

2. Socioeconomic Status

No significant difference was noticed.

3. Sex

As a reaction to mother's criticism, significantly more boys (thirty percent) showed "defensive verbal" than girls (ten percent).

c. Summary and Interpretation.

It is impossible to make any detailed statement on their attitudes, obedient or rebellious, toward the authoritative figure called parent, as no figure useful for making any conclusion was obtained. The above described sex difference, however, may suggest that at the ages of our sample, fathers' authority is not yet lost while mothers' authority is not much respected by sons.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

The report of this section is entirely omitted as it does not appear that any meaningful conclusion can be made from the obtained figures.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

When criticized by their siblings or some other children, twenty-nine percent of our sample made a mild reaction, twenty-one percent made a strong reaction, and only four percent made a positive acceptance. It may be natural for children to argue or quarrel when criticized by their peers. Sixteen percent of the mothers also reported that their children were never criticized by other children, although this report of mothers sounds somewhat questionable. When asked about the children's interpersonal relations with other children as many as eighty-eight percent of the mothers reported "average," a noncommittal response. Therefore, the information cannot be considered very useful. As for the influence by friends, the percentage of mothers who mentioned some specific influence was the largest (twenty-nine percent). These mothers may be the ones who made careful observation of their children's lives. On the other hand, twenty-five percent answered "nothing," which seems a rather large percentage. There was only one mother who reported a bad influence. Nineteen percent said that neither good nor bad influence was given, and fifteen percent reported a good influence. As for the child's reaction at the time when his (or her) feelings were hurt, forty-three percent showed hostility. Frequencies of other codes are omitted here, as it is difficult to make meaningful statements on them.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

When criticized by siblings or other children, the ten-year-olds (thirty-three percent) showed a strong reaction more frequently than the fourteen-year-olds (ten percent). The difference may be attributed to less cultivation of self-control among the ten-year-olds.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Relative to this variable, no significant difference was found. It means no positive statement can be made that children's interpersonal relationships differ by socioeconomic status.

3. Sex

When criticized by siblings or some other children, girls (forty percent) made a mild reaction more frequently than boys (eighteen percent).

c. Summary and Interpretation

As stated above, the possibility is slim in Japan to obtain reliable replies on this kind of question because subjective judgment means much in answering these questions. All that can be possibly stated in spite of such limitation has already been concisely described in previous sections.

VII. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

Upon being asked what the children would do when they had a worry, a large percentage (fifty-eight percent) of the mothers reported that they "talked about it to someone else." Nine percent indicated that their children attempted to cope with the worry by goal-directed action while six percent became depressed or hostile. There were sixteen percent who replied that he (or she) did not have any worry. As for the kinds of worry, "about studies" was thirty-three percent, the largest percentage. There is some contradiction here between the number reported as not worrying. On this question, thirty percent indicated that the child did not worry while on the previous question only sixteen percent gave this response. Ten percent worried about war, death, or physical health, while fourteen percent were worried about adolescent problems. As for the person to whom the children would turn for help when they had a worry, the most frequent answer was "to nobody," forty-one percent. Next to it was "to his (or her) mother" which was thirty-nine percent. The frequencies of other answers were respectively very small.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

No significant difference was noticed.

2. Socioeconomic Status

As for the kinds of worry, the upper-lower class had youth problems less frequently (three percent) than the upper-middle (eleven percent). It may be that the upper-lower class children are more mature.

3. Sex

No significant difference was noticed.

c. Summary and Interpretation

Here again it may be dangerous to rely too much on the obtained figures, but it is noteworthy that the number of children worrying about studies is large in Japan.

VIII. Aggression

a. Description of Frequencies

Minor grievance was given by the largest percentage (fifty-nine percent) as the cause of anger. That is, children easily get angry from minor dissatisfaction. The percentage of the children who got angry at parent's attitude or way was fifteen percent. There were two children who got angry at their own behavior, and three who seldom got angry. As for the children's attitude when they were angry, the percentages of verbal hostility (thirty percent) and hostile affect (twenty-six percent) were large, though the separation of these two categories would be often difficult. Those who used violence were eleven percent, and those who made withdrawal or retreat were ten percent, while there was no child who controlled his (or her) anger. Their attitude, when they were angry at their mothers was about the same as the above: verbal aggression, forty-one percent; hostile affect, twenty percent; withdrawal, five percent; control of affect and other codes, zero percent. There were thirteen children (sixteen percent) who were classified as "withdrawal plus a need of affect." As for the attitude when angry at their fathers, the children seemed to react differently in accordance with the situation. Therefore, the code of specific attitude gained the largest percentage (thirty-one percent). Verbal aggression was sixteen percent, hostile affect twenty-one percent, withdrawal eight percent, and control of affect was four percent, though some responses classified under these categories may be similar with, or overlapping, those classified under the first-mentioned code. When some friend was angry at the sample child, sixteen percent of the sample children expressed hostile affect and fifty percent tried to find other friends. Thirty-six percent of mothers did not know what their child did in this situation, while fifteen percent denied that it happens.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There was nothing special to be described.

2. Socioeconomic Status

When the child was angry at his (or her) father, and when a friend was angry at him (or her), a larger percentage of the upper-lower class children (thirty-three percent and twenty-eight percent) expressed hostile emotion than the upper-middle class children (ten percent and five percent).

3. Sex

Among the causes of anger, the girls' frequency of minor grievances (seventy-three percent) was larger than the boys' (forty-five percent).

c. Summary and Interpretation

For the same reason as stated in the previous section, detailed discussion was omitted.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

No meaningful result was obtained from the question "How do you think he does in school?" as the meaning of the question was vague and a large number of mothers did not directly show in their replies whether they were satisfied with their children or not. As for the way to encourage their children to study, "attitudinal" was forty-nine percent, the largest percentage. What was classified under this code was, for example, a simple encouragement, or to tell the child that study is for his (or her) own future. Twenty-five percent of the mothers said they did nothing. When asked if the mothers had ever met their children's homeroom teachers, the percentage of the mothers who had met them in "a formal routine occasion such as a PTA meeting" was the largest (sixty-one percent), and those who had had some problems and spontaneously had gone to see them in a non-formal occasion was nineteen percent. Six percent had never met them. Item Thirty-One was omitted as there was a mistake in the Japanese translation of the question. When asked their views on the role of the school about seventy percent, or an overwhelming majority of the mothers, replied in general terms such as "to educate children." Therefore, no detailed analysis seems useful. As for the importance of school, sixty-six percent considered it most important, while no one considered it unimportant. The reasons why they considered the role of schools important or unimportant varied very much. Beside the thirty percent of "preparation for life," specific answers amounted to as many as thirty-three percent. Such a variety of answers must have reflexively come out as the mothers were asked what they had not thought about in their daily life. "Personal" or "social" development was mentioned by twenty-five percent of the mothers.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

There were no significant age differences.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Regarding the role of school, the upper-lower class (twenty-eight percent) exceeded the upper-middle (eight percent) in a somewhat special reply that the education of children is primarily the family's responsibility and naturally the role of the school is rather limited. On the other hand, the upper-middle (thirty-eight percent) mentioned "the development of an individual and society" as the reason for the importance of school more frequently than the upper-lower class (thirteen percent).

3. Sex

No significant difference was found except in Item Thirty-One.

c. Summary and Interpretation

All the above described, when put together, clearly depict one of the Japanese parents' characteristics. That is their absolute reliance on school. To put it in more extreme terms, they have an attitude that education may be left to school and one need not think about it on his own.

II. Authority

a. Description of Frequencies

Being asked how they would go about getting their children to do something for them, seventy percent of the mothers said "mild request" while "strong request" and "order" together were fourteen percent. As for the kind of follow-up needed to see that their children surely did as requested, the percentage of the mothers who said "no follow-up was needed" was forty-one percent, the largest. This was followed by the thirty percent of "remind or explain." In thirteen percent of the cases the mother nagged or used emotional appeal. When mothers found that their children were not doing a job the right way, fifty-eight percent of the mothers, the largest group, demonstrated the right way. Twenty-one percent went for a harsh way such as "bawling out," or "punishing," while sixteen percent gave the child the opportunity to work out the correct solution for himself. When asked how they usually disciplined their children, forty-one percent of the mothers indicated they used mild verbal means, while only one mother was strongly verbal. Twenty-eight percent used physical punishment. Fifteen percent preferred discussion or praise while ten percent reported never disciplining or punishing their child. Thirty-six percent of the mothers reported that the father never disciplined the child. Of those fathers who did use discipline, twenty-six percent favored mild verbal methods, sixteen percent used discussion or praise, and fifteen percent used physical punishment.

b. Significant Differences

By any demographic variable, no significant difference was found.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The only remark which can be forcibly made here may be that authority relationships between parent and child are generally maintained in a moderate way.

III. Interpersonal Relations

a. Description of Frequencies

Being asked what they did to help their children get along with other children, thirty-eight percent of the mothers answered that they encouraged social activity, which is quite understandable. However, there were thirty-six percent of the mothers who did nothing. Sixteen percent gave some training either of a positive or negative nature.

b. Significant Differences

By any demographic variable , no significant difference was found.

c. Summary and Interpretation

It may be said that left to themselves children of any age or any social class make friends and are happy.

IV. Anxiety

a. Description of Frequencies

As for the kind of advice the mothers gave their children when the children were worried, many mothers "gave support" or advised a means of "tension reduction." These two codes together amounted to fifty-five percent, the largest percentage. This result may be very natural. Eighteen percent of mothers advised direct action at the source of the worry, fourteen percent of mothers indicated their child did not worry.

b. Significant Differences

No significant difference was found by any demographic variable.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

a. Description of Frequencies

As for the courses of training taken by mothers since they left school, twenty-eight percent listed recreational courses and another twenty-eight percent listed domestic ones. Professional-intellectual was twenty-four percent, and thirteen percent did not take any. As for the purpose of taking the course, "personal and social" was fifty-six percent. But, when this kind of classification is used, the obtained figures seem to mean very little. As for the time of taking the course, sixty percent took it "shortly after school" which was followed by the nineteen percent of "over a long period." When asked if they completed the course, "no," "some of them," and "yes," were about the same, being around twenty-nine percent, respectively. As for the gains from it, affirmative was seventy-three percent and negative was fifteen percent.

II. Occupational Aspects

a. Description of Frequencies

When the twenty-five mothers who had a job were asked about the reason for having it and the process through which they came to be in their particular kind of job, "family trade" and "financial returns" were the most frequent replies, each code receiving nine replies. The item asking the type of work mothers did is omitted here as the classification of its replies cannot be considered to have any meaningful purpose. To the question of how they feel about their job, inappropriate answers, that is, the answers of mothers without jobs, amounted to as much as seventy-one percent, which made the classification of little meaning. Those who showed positive affect about their job were sixteen percent and those showing negative affect were two mothers. When asked if they would choose the same kind of work in case they were to choose a job again, negative answers (eighteen percent) exceeded positive ones (ten percent), though inappropriate answers again amounted to as many as seventy-three percent. These results seemingly contradict each other. This may be just an example of the rule that answers change in accordance with the way of phrasing a question. To questions asking what they will do when they are on the job and problems come up about the work, what is the best way to get along with their fellow workers, and what is the best way to get along with their bosses, inappropriate answers were as many as between seventy-four percent and seventy-six percent. Therefore, remarks on the answers to these questions are all omitted.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

No significant difference was observed.

2. Socioeconomic Status

Though significant differences were found in many categories and items, they do not seem to be very meaningful. Therefore, the details are omitted.

3. Sex

No significant difference was observed.

c. Summary and Interpretation

The following may not be unique to Japan, but it must be pointed out that when women are engaged in work they often work in the store or the small factory which their whole family runs. The nature of their work in this case is different from the genuine paid work or the work which is supervised by an entirely unrelated person.

III. Personal Characteristics

a. Description of Frequencies

When asked "What do you think or do when criticized?" the percentage of the mothers whose replies were classified under the category of "rational analysis" was fifty percent. The mothers who made negative replies, such as "ignores," "dislikes," and "defensive verbal," were all together thirty-four percent. The latter kinds of answers may be honest answers. As for the reaction to their husbands' criticism, rational analysis was fifty-nine percent and negative reactions were twenty-nine percent. In case of friend's criticism, rational analysis was thirty-five percent and negative reactions were fourteen percent. The reason the percentages of these two categories were small with regard to friend's criticism was that as many as twenty-nine percent of the mothers answered that it would never occur. When criticized by their own children, rational analysis was fifty percent and negative reactions were twenty-four percent. The ratio of negative reaction is smaller when criticized by closely related persons than by other persons. When asked what they get angry at, forty-four percent of the mothers named a child as the source of anger. That is, mothers often get angry at the behavior and/or attitude of the children they have the closest contact with. The percentage of mothers who get angry at strong annoyance plus unjust accusation was twenty-three percent, a quite natural figure. It is interesting, however, that both "actions originating in self," and "petty annoyance" were indicated, respectively, by eleven percent of the mothers. Fifty-three percent of the mothers indicated that they resorted to verbal or physical aggression when they were angry. Eleven percent indicated that they coped actively with anger.

b. Significant Differences

1. Age

More mothers of the ten-year-old than those of fourteen-year-old children gave the reply that when criticized by friends they used rational analysis in coping with the criticism.

2. Socioeconomic Status

The mothers of the upper-middle class exceeded those of the upper-lower class in the code of "never criticized by children."

3. Sex

More mothers of girls than those of boys made rational analysis responses when they were criticized by their own children. This may be true.

c. Summary and Interpretation

There is nothing to be especially noted.

MOTHER DESCRIPTION - SCALE SCORE INTER-CORRELATIONS

Child Behavior

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 1

There was only one significant correlation out of a possible thirty-six. Engagement in the Task Achievement (Academic) area correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Authority - Table 2

There were seven significant correlations out of the thirty possible, six positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother, while Attitude Toward Task Achievement (Academic) correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father. Persistence also correlated with this last-named variable.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 3

There were two significant correlations out of the eighteen, one positive and one negative. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children and positively with Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations when the problem was that of being criticized by other children.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 4

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Aggression - Table 5

Three out of the twenty-four correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends; Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general, while Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Authority - Table 6

Three out of the thirty correlations were significant. Activity

Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) also correlated with this variable. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 7

Two correlations were significant out of the eighteen possible, one positive and one negative. Activity Level defined as number of hobbies correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when feelings were hurt by friends, while Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 8

Four out of the twelve correlations were significant. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated with Coping Effectiveness and Implementation in the Anxiety area while Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness but negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Aggression - Table 9

Two correlations out of the twenty-four were significant, one positive and one negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general, while Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 10

Three out of the fifteen correlations were significant, two negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother correlated with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by mother correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 11

Five out of the ten correlations were significant, three of them positive and two of them negative. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and father and when criticized by father, while Implementation in the Anxiety area correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father.

Authority x Aggression - Table 12

Four out of the twenty correlations were significant, three of them negative and one of them positive. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 13

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 14

Three out of the twelve correlations were significant, two of them positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children correlated negatively with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends. Coping Effectiveness when the child's feelings were hurt correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Anxiety x Aggression - Table 15

One out of the eight correlations was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area correlated with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Summary

Forty out of the possible two hundred seventy-five correlations were significant, twenty-seven of them positive and thirteen of them negative.

Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends had the highest number of correlations with other variables, seven in all. It correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), with Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother and when criticized by father, with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area and negatively with Coping Effectiveness when criticized in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children.

Both Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and when disciplined by the father correlated with six other variables.

Only one variable, Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) had no significant correlations with any other variable.

Child Behavior x Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 16

Six correlations out of the eighteen were significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with amount of Parental Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement, Parental Initiation in contacting school and Parental Academic Aspiration. Attitude, Persistence and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) all correlated with amount of Parental Satisfaction with Child's Academic Task Achievement.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 17

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 18

Two correlations were significant out of the eighteen possible, one negative and one positive. Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school, indicating that those children whose parents saw the major function of school as being more than just Task Achievement were more likely to engage in Task Achievement (Academic) behavior. Attitude Toward Task Achievement (Academic) correlated positively with Parent's Attitude toward importance of school.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 19

Four correlations out of the eighteen were significant, three positive and one negative. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) as assessed on two different questions correlated positively with amount of parental satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement. Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated negatively with Parental Academic Aspiration, while Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated positively with the same variable.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 20

Three out of the twelve correlations were significant, all of them negative. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated with reason for the child having a job around the house, emphasis on the child's personality development scoring high. Initiation and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) both correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 21

One out of the eighteen correlations was significant. Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated with Parental Conception of the major function of school, Task Achievement and socioeconomic reasons receiving the higher score.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 22

Four of the fifteen possible correlations were significant, one negative and three positive. Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother correlated with Parental Initiation in contacting school. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother correlated negatively with amount of Parental Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father correlated with Parental Initiation in contacting school and Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father correlated with amount of Parental Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 23

Two significant correlations out of the possible ten were significant, both of them negative. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by mother correlated negatively with the reason for the child having chores around the house, emphasis on the child's personality development scoring high.

Authority x School - Table 24

Two out of the fifteen possible correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother correlated negatively with Parental Conception of the major function of school with Task Achievement and socioeconomic reasons scoring high. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father correlated positively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 25

One out of the nine correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when the child had his feelings hurt correlated negatively with amount of satisfaction over child's Academic Task Achievement.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 26

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 27

One out of the nine correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children correlated with Parent's Conception of the major function of school.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 28

Two out of the six possible correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area correlated positively with amount of satisfaction by parents over child's Academic Task Achievement while Implementation in Anxiety correlated negatively with the same variable.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 29

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x School - Table 30

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 31

Four out of the twelve correlations were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general correlated negatively with Parental Satisfaction at child's Academic Task Achievement, Parental Initiation in contacting school and parental Academic Aspiration, while Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends had a high negative correlation with Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 32

One out of the eight correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother correlated with the reason for the child having jobs around the house.

Aggression x School - Table 33

One out of the twelve correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father correlated with Parental Conception of the major function of school.

Summary

Thirty-four out of the two hundred eight correlations were significant, fifteen of them negative and nineteen of them positive.

Parental Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, thirteen all told, five of them negative and eight of them positive.

It correlated positively with Attitude, Coping Effectiveness, Engagement and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic); with two assessments of Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic); negatively with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother and positively when criticized; negatively with Coping Effectiveness in the Interpersonal Relations area when the child's feelings were hurt; positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area but negatively with Implementation in the same area; negatively with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and when angry with friends.

Five variables, all in the Child Behavior area, had no significant correlations with other variables. These were Initiation and Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic); Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic); Coping Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relations defined as getting along well with other children, and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

Child Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 34

One correlation was significant out of twelve. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Parental Implementation in schoolwork.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 35

Three correlations out of twelve were significant, one negative and two positive. Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Both Attitude and Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 36

Four correlations out of the thirty were significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Academic) correlated with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction. Engagement correlated with Degree of Guidance given by the parent in the Interpersonal Relations area while Persistence correlated with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction and Degree of Guidance by parents in Interpersonal Relations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 37

Two out of the six correlations were significant, one positive and one negative. Engagement correlated positively and Persistence negatively with Degree of Guidance given by the parent in an Anxiety situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 38

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 39

One out of the twelve correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 40

Two out of the thirty correlations were significant, one negative and one positive. Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated positively and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) correlated negatively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 41

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 42

There were no significant correlations.

Authority x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 43

Two out of the twelve correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by mother correlated with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the father correlated with Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Authority x Interpersonal Relations - Table 44

Five out of the thirty correlations were significant. Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother correlated with Activity Level Mother-Child Interaction, while Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father correlated with Activity Level for both Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions and with Positive Affect for Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions.

Authority x Anxiety - Table 45

Degree of Guidance given by the parents in the Anxiety area correlated both with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 46

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 47

One out of the six correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when the child's feelings were hurt correlated negatively with Parental Directedness in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 48

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 49

One correlation out of the three was significant. Coping Effectiveness when the child's feelings were hurt correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 50

Implementation in Anxiety correlated negatively with Parental Implementation in schoolwork. None of the other correlations were significant.

Anxiety x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 51

There were no significant correlations.

Anxiety x Interpersonal Relations - Table 52

Three correlations out of the eight possible were significant, two of them negative and one positive. Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area correlated negatively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction and positively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction, while Implementation in the Anxiety area correlated negatively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction.

Anxiety x Anxiety - Table 53

One out of the two correlations was significant. Implementation in the Anxiety area correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 54

One out of the eight correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of schoolwork.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 55

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 56

Three correlations out of twenty were significant, all of them negative. Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general correlated negatively with Activity Level and Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction, while Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father correlated negatively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 57

One out of four correlations was significant. Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends correlated negatively with Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area.

Summary

Thirty-four out of the two hundred thirty-five correlations were significant, fifteen of them negative and nineteen positive.

Activity Level Father-Child Interaction had the greatest number of correlations with other variables, seven in all, three positive and four negative. It correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Task Achievement (Academic) area, with Activity Level in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area and with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father. It correlated negatively with Initiation in the Task Achievement (Nonacademic) area, with Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area, with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and with Coping Effectiveness when angry with the father.

Degree of Guidance by Parents in the Anxiety area also correlated with seven variables, three positive and four negative. It correlated positively with Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when told to do something by the mother and with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother. It correlated negatively with Persistence in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when feelings are hurt, with Implementation in the Anxiety area and with Coping Effectiveness when angry with friends.

Nine variables had no significant correlations with other variables. Eight were in the Child Behavior area. They were Initiation in Task

Achievement (Academic), Activity Level, Initiation and Implementation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), Coping Effectiveness when criticized by the mother, Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends and Coping Effectiveness in getting along well with other children and Coping Effectiveness when angry with the mother.

In the Parent Treatment of Child area the only variable that did not correlated with any of the Child Behavior variables was Parental Impletation in homework.

Parent Behavior x Child Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 58

Three correlations out of a possible twenty were significant, all positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband correlated with child's Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), this variable being assessed on two different questions in the interview schedule, while Coping Effectiveness when criticized by children correlated positively with child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Academic).

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 59

Four correlations out of a possible twenty were significant. Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general correlated positively with child's Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic). Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic), while mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated positively with the child's Activity Level in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Interpersonal Relations x Authority - Table 60

Four correlations out of the sixteen were significant, all of them positive. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father, while mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness both when disciplined by father and by mother.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 61

There was one significant correlation out of twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness when his feelings were hurt by another child.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 62

There were two significant correlations out of eight, one positive and one negative. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area, while mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated negatively with child's Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 63

Only one correlation was significant out of the sixteen possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated negatively with child's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 64

One correlation out of a possible six was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area correlated positively with child's Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic).

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 65

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Authority - Table 66

There was one significant correlation out of the five possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 67

There was one significant correlation out of the three possible. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 68

Two correlations out of the two possible were significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area correlated positively with child's Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area and negatively with child's Implementation in the same area.

Aggression x Aggression - Table 69

One out of the four possible correlations was significant. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area correlated with child's Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general.

Summary

Of the one hundred thirty possible correlations twenty-one were significant, three of them negative and eighteen of them positive.

Two variables had six correlations with other variables. They were mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband and mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area.

The first variable correlated positively with Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic) assessed on two different questions, with Coping Effectiveness and Initiation in Task Achievement (Nonacademic) and with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the father and Coping Effectiveness in the Anxiety area.

The second variable correlated positively with Engagement in Task Achievement (Academic), with Coping Effectiveness when disciplined by the mother, with Coping Effectiveness when criticized by other children, with Coping Effectiveness with Aggression in general and in the Anxiety area and negatively with Implementation in the Anxiety area.

Twelve variables did not have any significant correlations with the other variables. They were all in the Child Behavior area.

Parent Behavior

Interpersonal Relations x Aggression - Table 70

There was one significant correlation out of the four possible. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated positively with Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area.

Parent Behavior x Parent Attitude

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 71

There were four significant correlations out of a possible twelve. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by her husband correlated positively with Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement and with Parental Initiation in contacting school. Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated significantly with Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement and with Parental Academic Aspiration.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 72

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x School - Table 73

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 74

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 75

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x School - Table 76

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only four out of a possible forty correlations were significant, all coming in the Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) matrix.

Parent Behavior x Parent Treatment of Child

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 77

There was one significant correlation out of a possible eight. Coping Effectiveness with criticism in general correlated positively with Parental Implementation of homework.

Interpersonal Relations x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 78

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Interpersonal Relations - Table 79

There was one significant correlation out of a possible twenty. Mother's Coping Effectiveness when criticized by friends correlated positively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 80

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 81

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 82

There were no significant correlations.

Aggression x Interpersonal Relations - Table 83

There was one significant correlation out of a possible five. Mother's Coping Effectiveness in the Aggression area correlated positively with Positive Affect Mother-Child Interaction.

Aggression x Anxiety - Table 84

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Only three out of a possible fifty correlations were significant. Seven of the Parent Treatment of Child variables had no correlations with other variables but only one of the Parent Behavior variables did not correlate significantly with any other variables.

Parent Attitude

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 85

There were two significant correlations out of a possible six, one positive and one negative. Parental Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement correlated positively with the reason for the child having jobs around the house with child's personality development receiving a high score, while Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement correlated negatively with Parental Occupational Aspiration.

Task Achievement (Academic) x School - Table 86

There was one significant correlation out of a possible nine. Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement correlated positively with Parental Attitude toward importance of school.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x School - Table 87

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Three correlations out of a possible twenty-one were significant, one negative and two positive. Four variables did not have any significant correlations with other variables.

Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 88

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 89

There was one significant correlation out of a possible ten. Parental Implementation of schoolwork correlated positively with Activity Level Mother-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 90

Parental Implementation of schoolwork correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in an Anxiety situation.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 91

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 92

There were no significant correlations.

Interpersonal Relations x Anxiety - Table 93

There were no significant correlations.

Summary

Two correlations out of a possible thirty-three were significant, both of them positive. Seven of the ten variables had no significant correlations.

Parent Attitude x Parent Treatment of Child

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 94

One correlation out of a possible six was significant. Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement correlated negatively with Parental Implementation of homework.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 95

One correlation out of a possible six was significant. Parental Academic Aspiration correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

Task Achievement (Academic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 96

Seven out of a possible fifteen correlations were significant, all of them positive. Parent's Satisfaction with child's Academic Task Achievement correlated with Activity Level Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions and Positive Affect Mother-Child and Father-Child Interactions. Parental Initiation in contacting school correlated with Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction and Parental Academic Aspiration correlated with Activity Level and Positive Affect Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Academic) x Anxiety - Table 97

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 98

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic)x Task Achievement (Nonacademic)-Table 99

There were no significant correlations.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Interpersonal Relations - Table 100

One correlation out of a possible ten was significant. Parental Occupational Aspiration correlated positively with Activity Level Father-Child Interaction.

Task Achievement (Nonacademic) x Anxiety - Table 101

There were no significant correlations.

School x Task Achievement (Academic) - Table 102

There was one significant correlation out of a possible six. Parental Attitude toward importance of school correlated positively Parental Implementation of schoolwork.

School x Task Achievement (Nonacademic) - Table 103

There was one significant correlation out of six. Parental Attitude toward importance of school correlated positively with Degree of Guidance by parents in Task Achievement (Nonacademic).

School x Interpersonal Relations - Table 104

There were no significant correlations.

School x Anxiety - Table 105

All correlations were significant, Degree of Guidance by parents in the Anxiety area correlating positively with Parent's Conception of major function of school and with Parental Attitude toward importance of school. It correlated negatively with Parent's Conception of the major function of school when the information was obtained by asking the parents why they thought school was important.

Summary

Fifteen out of the eighty possible correlations were significant, two of them negative and thirteen of them positive. There were three variables that had no significant correlations with other variables.

MOTHER/FATHER COMPARISONS - MOTHER/FATHER CHI-SQUARE

Description of the Sample

At the beginning of Stage II, the mothers to be interviewed were decided with the following procedure. First, the hundred pupils of each group of the Stage I sample were divided into high-score and low-score groups (fifty in each) by the median of their achievement test scores. Then, more than five pupils were randomly sampled from each of sixteen subgroups obtained in the above manner; their mothers were requested to co-operate with our interview. The number of mothers whose complete data were actually obtained ranged from eleven to fifteen in each of eight groups.

When these mothers were interviewed, our desire to interview their husband was told to them. As it is naturally more difficult to obtain the father's co-operation with the interview, the number of fathers who positively responded to our request was between six and nine in each group, only a few more than five which was the needed number. In none of the sixteen subgroups was the number of the interviewed fathers less than two or three, which was the needed number in each subgroup.

After all the data were collected on those interviewees, the sample of ten mothers and five fathers who were the husbands of the sampled mothers was finally decided for each of the eight groups so that the sample would be representative as much as possible regarding their social status, occupation and child's academic achievements. Such consideration was made in the selection of fathers as well as mothers. Therefore, our sample of eighty mothers and that of forty fathers are considered well representative of the original sample of eight hundred pupils. It was also considered that our sample of fathers well represented that of mothers.

In the following the significant differences found between mother's responses and father's will be described on each item. No description will be given on the items where no significant difference was found in any category of the item.

Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

When asked how their child felt about school, significantly more mothers (fifty-nine percent) than fathers (thirty-five percent) indicated that their child's feelings were positive ones.

Concerning homework, more fathers (sixty-five percent) indicated that their child did it but gave no reference as to when it was done as compared to forty percent of mothers. That is, more fathers answered only in a gross term. In summary, mothers were more concerned with their child and have a more favorable view than fathers.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

The only significant difference here concerned the type of work the parent thought the child would like to do when he grew up. Only eight percent of mothers as compared to twenty-three percent of fathers said they did not know.

VII. Anxiety

The lack of knowledge about their children shown in the Occupational area appeared also in the Anxiety area. When asked what their children worried about, five percent of mothers said they did not know, but thirty-five percent of fathers gave this response.

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

Significantly more mothers (ninety-four percent) had met their child's teacher. Fifty-two percent of fathers said they had not. Nineteen percent of mothers had spontaneously made contact with the teacher but no fathers had done this. Not only did mothers visit their child's teacher more frequently but they had more enthusiasm than fathers.

Although some significant differences did occur on the question asking what the parent did to see that the child got his homework done this had to be omitted from discussion as the Japanese translation of the question did not correctly convey the original meaning to the interviewees.

Parents were asked why they thought school was important. Fathers (forty-five percent) stressed personal and social development much more than mothers (twenty-five percent). Thirty-three percent of mothers gave reasons which were not readily classifiable, while only five percent of fathers did this.

II. Authority

When they wanted the child to do something, thirty percent of fathers made a strong request whereas only eleven percent of mothers would adopt this method. Fathers are more oppressive.

III. Interpersonal Relations

Parents were asked if they did anything to help their child get along with other children. Fifty-eight precent of fathers said they did nothing but only thirty-six percent of mothers gave this response. On the other hand the number of mothers encouraging social activity was much larger (thirty-eight percent as compared to thirteen percent). Mothers were eager in encouraging their child to have good relationships with friends but fathers were not quite so eager. In view of their respective degree of contact with their child this result sounds quite natural.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

In response to the question "Have you taken any courses or training since you left school?" the number of fathers answering "no" was larger than that of mothers (forty-three percent compared to thirteen percent). Of those who had taken courses, seventy-eight percent of fathers but only twenty-seven percent of mothers had taken those of a professional and/or intellectual nature. However, thirty-one percent of mothers had taken recreational courses as compared with thirteen percent of fathers and while thirty-one percent of mothers had taken domestic courses no father had taken a course of this nature. In Japan, boys usually have a job right after graduation from school and once engaged in a job have few opportunities to take any courses or training because of the shortage of leisure time. If they have any opportunity, they mostly take a training related with their profession. On the other hand, girls have some amount of leisure time, large or small, until they get married, which they often spend in learning tea-ceremony, flower-arrangement and cooking so that they will make good housewives.

Those who had taken courses were asked their reasons for taking them. Fifty-seven percent of fathers but only fourteen percent of mothers gave economic pressure as a reason. Sixty-four percent of mothers as compared to thirteen percent of fathers mentioned personal or social reasons. This is consistent with what was described above.

When asked when they took these courses sixty-nine percent of mothers said shortly after leaving school. Only thirty-five percent of fathers came in this category. This is also due to the same situations as described above.

When asked if they had completed the courses, thirty-four percent of fathers but only nine percent of mothers gave the response "some of them."

II. Occupational Aspects

In Japan, twenty-five of the eighty mothers worked and all forty fathers worked. When asked how they came to be in this kind of work, eight percent of mothers said they wanted it, while forty percent of fathers gave this motivation, a sizable difference. Ninety-two percent of mothers gave responses classified in the combined rare response category as compared to sixty percent of the fathers.

When asked what their job was like, ninety-two percent of mothers and ninety-seven percent of fathers gave purely descriptive responses.

When asked how they felt about their job, fifty-two percent of mothers and fifty-five percent of fathers gave positive affective responses. Thirty-two percent of the mothers and forty-two percent of the fathers gave neutral or ambivalent responses.

When asked what they liked about their job, sixteen percent of mothers and thirty-five percent of fathers mentioned special characteristics of the job, a difference which is most likely significant. For the combined rare response category, thirty-six percent of mothers' and thirty-seven percent of fathers' responses fell in this category.

When asked what they disliked about their job, sixteen percent of mothers and thirty-five percent of fathers said they disliked nothing. Falling into the combined rare response category were thirty-six percent of mothers' responses and thirty-seven percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked if they would choose the same type of work again if they had another choice, fifty-six percent of mothers and sixty percent of fathers said no, indicating a sizable amount of job dissatisfaction. Thirty-two percent of the mothers and thirty-five percent of the fathers said they would do the same kind of work if they chose again.

When asked what they did when problems arose on the job, sixteen percent of mothers and sixty-two percent of fathers said they would do the same kind of work if they chose again.

When asked what they did when problems arose on the job, sixteen percent of mothers and sixty-two percent of fathers said they would solve it themselves. This was a sizable difference and was, without doubt, significant. Falling in the combined rare response category were sixty-eight percent of mothers' responses and twenty percent of the fathers' responses.

When asked what was the best way to get along with fellow workers, sixteen percent of mothers and thirty-two percent of fathers mentioned good social relations or being friendly, the percentage of fathers falling in this category being twice that of the mothers. Tolerance or understanding was mentioned by forty percent of both mothers and fathers.

When asked what was the best way to get along with the boss or supervisor, forty-five percent of mothers and thirty-seven percent of fathers indicated that the question was not applicable, since they worked alone. Falling into the combined rare response category was thirty-six percent of the mothers' responses and twenty-seven percent of fathers' responses.

III. Personal Characteristics

When asked what made them angry forty-four percent of mothers said ten percent of fathers mentioned their child as a source of anger while thirty-three percent of fathers but only nine percent of mothers mentioned annoying behavior of others or work-related problems.

IV. Occupational Values

The interviewees were asked to give ranks to the fifteen occupational values which were used in the Occupational Value Test of Stage I as well as Stage III. Among the fifteen, a significant difference between mothers and fathers was found only in the fifth Value: Success. The number of mothers who placed it at the bottom was nine while that of fathers was fourteen (x2). Though the result can be interpreted in various ways; no definite conclusion is possible here.

FIGURE 2

ITEM 4 What adults live in your Home? INTERCOUNTRY CHI-SQUARE MOTHER INTERVIEW

BRAZIL	1	47	10	22	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	2	59	11	8	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	0	0	0	0	80	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	1	65	10	3	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	0	45	26	9	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	3	53	15	7	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	2	63	6	1	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	2	77	3	0	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	0	61	19	0	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 796.716 WITH 24 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	2	3	4	5
BRAZIL	47	10	22	0
ENGLAND	59	11	8	0
GERMANY	0	0	0	80
ITALY	65	10	3	1
JAPAN	45	26	9	0
MEXICO	53	15	7	1
CHICAGO	63	6	1	0
AUSTIN	77	3	0	0
YUGOSLAVIA	61	19	0	0
CHI-SQUARE	217.8	53.1	78.3	693.6
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 One parent	(02 + 03)
2 Both parents	(01 + 04)
3 Parent(s) + relative (s)	(05 + 06)
4 Parent (s) - Non-relative(s)	(07 + 08 + 91)
9	(99)

ITEM 5 Who takes care of X? (Main responsibility for X)

BRAZIL	30	37	10	2	1	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	32	43	3	2	0	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	14	56	3	3	1	3	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	17	57	1	2	3	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	9	71	0	0	0	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	20	48	5	0	5	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	17	54	1	0	0	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	45	37	0	0	0	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	46	25	6	1	1	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 118.634 WITH 16 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	1	2	0
BRAZIL	30	37	13
ENGLAND	32	43	5
GERMANY	14	56	10
ITALY	17	57	6
JAPAN	9	71	0
MEXICO	20	48	11
CHICAGO	17	54	1
AUSTIN	45	37	0
YUGOSLAVIA	46	25	9
CHI-SQUARE	78.5	84.6	34.3
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.0001

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Both Parents	(01)
2 Mother only	(02)
3 Father only	(03)
4 Parent and non-parent	(06 + 07)
5 Non-parent	(04 + 05)
9	(99)

ITEM 7 Birth Place (Mother)

BRAZIL	31	31	0	9	4	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	50	3	0	5	8	14	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	18	1	15	13	14	19	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	26	5	10	22	16	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	1	31	1	5	41	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	30	0	1	11	30	7	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	15	17	0	9	29	2	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	11	10	33	9	15	4	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	11	13	46	7	0	3	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 516.477 WITH 40 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	5	6
BRAZIL	31	31	0	9	4	5
ENGLAND	50	3	0	5	8	14
GERMANY	18	1	15	13	14	19
ITALY	26	5	10	22	16	1
JAPAN	1	31	1	5	41	1
MEXICO	30	0	1	11	30	7
CHICAGO	15	17	0	9	29	2
AUSTIN	11	10	33	9	15	4
YUGOSLAVIA	11	13	46	7	0	3
CHI-SQUARE	106.6	110.5	221.7	24.4	110.1	53.7
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0023	.0000	.0000

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Same town	(01)
2 Different town, same state	(02)
3 Rural area	(03)
4 Adjacent state	(04)
5 Same country, different state	(05)
6 Different country	(06 + 07)
9	(93 + 99)

ITEM 8 Birth Place (Father)

```
BRAZIL         26   30    0   12    5    6    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        40    9    0    3   12   16    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        24    7   16    4   12   17    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          24    4   12   21   17    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           5   31    2    7   34    1    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         34    0    2   11   28    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         5   17    2   13   32    2    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         12    5   32   12   20    1    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     22   16   35    6    1    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  409.998 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    5    0
BRAZIL         26   30    0   12    5    7
ENGLAND        40    9    0    3   12   16
GERMANY        24    7   16    4   12   17
ITALY          24    4   12   21   17    2
JAPAN           5   31    2    7   34    1
MEXICO         34    0    2   11   28    4
CHICAGO         5   17    2   13   32    3
AUSTIN         12    5   32   12   20    1
YUGOSLAVIA     22   16   35    6    1    0
CHI-SQUARE   72.4 91.7 153.4 29.4 83.8 62.9
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0005 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Same Town	(01)
2	Different town, same state	(02)
3	Rural Area	(03)
4	Adjacent State	(04)
5	Same Country, different state	(05)
6	Different country	(06 + 07)
9		(93 + 99)

ITEM 9 Mother's Year of Birth

```
BRAZIL          7   25   33   11    0    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         6   15   31   16    0   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         9   19   37   12    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           6   16   30   20    0    8   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           7   29   24   12    0    8   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         12   26   23   11    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         4   18   25   20    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         13   23   21   18    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      9   26   22   10    0   13   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  47.331 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0397

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    6
BRAZIL          7   25   33   11    4
ENGLAND         6   15   31   16   12
GERMANY         9   19   37   12    3
ITALY           6   16   30   20    8
JAPAN           7   29   24   12    8
MEXICO         12   26   23   11    7
CHICAGO         4   18   25   20    5
AUSTIN         13   23   21   18    7
YUGOSLAVIA      9   26   22   10   13
CHI-SQUARE    8.5 11.9 13.8 12.7 12.9
PROB.       .3855 .1557 .0869 .1210 .1167
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	25-34	(01 + 02)
2	35-39	(03)
3	40-44	(04)
4	45-49	(05)
5	65 or over	(09)
9	50-64	(06+07+08+99)

ITEM 10 Father's year of birth

```
BRAZIL         16   23   26   10    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        12   22   22   16    8   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        15   24   23    9    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           4   21   28   16   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          15   30   15    9   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         19   19   20    7   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        16   23   13   15    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         15   28   16   12   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     19   24   17    8   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  41.808 WITH 32 DF.   P = .1154

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    5
BRAZIL         16   23   26   10    5
ENGLAND        12   22   22   16    8
GERMANY        15   24   23    9    9
ITALY           4   21   28   16   11
JAPAN          15   30   15    9   11
MEXICO         19   19   20    7   14
CHICAGO        16   23   13   15    5
AUSTIN         15   28   16   12   11
YUGOSLAVIA     19   24   17    8   12
CHI-SQUARE   14.3  5.1 12.9 11.3  8.3
PROB.       .0750 .7477 .1161 .1851 .4047
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	25-39	(01+02+03)
2	40-44	(04)
3	45-49	(05)
4	50-54	(06)
9	55-65 or over	(07+08+09+99)

ITEM 11 Mother's Occupation

```
BRAZIL          0    8    2    3    3   64   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         5   15    3   13    8   36   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         7    2    4    3    2   62   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           3    3    5    2    1   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           1    2    5   13    3   56   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          0    7    2    3    1   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         2    3    2    7    0   58   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN          2   16   13    4    5   42   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      6   17   10   10   10   27   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 135.588 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        2     4     6     0
BRAZIL          8     3    64     5
ENGLAND        15    13    36    16
GERMANY         2     3    62    13
ITALY           3     2    66     9
JAPAN           2    13    56     9
MEXICO          7     3    66     3
CHICAGO         3     7    58     4
AUSTIN         16     4    42    20
YUGOSLAVIA     17    10    27    26
CHI-SQUARE   41.7  27.1 101.5  46.6
PROB.       .0000 .0010 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	(01+02)
2	(03)
3	(04)
4	(05)
5	(06)
9	(08+99)

ITEM 12 Father's Occupation

```
BRAZIL         23    7   13   11   26   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        17   23    0   32    8   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         2   36    2   40    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          19   16   10   21   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          12   27    4   35    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         26    5   18   19   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         5   34    6    2   25   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         11   26   14   19   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      6   12   24   19   19   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 245.658 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5
BRAZIL         23     7    13    11    26
ENGLAND        17    23     0    32     8
GERMANY         2    36     2    40     0
ITALY          19    16    10    21    14
JAPAN          12    27     4    35     2
MEXICO         26     5    18    19    11
CHICAGO         5    34     6     2    25
AUSTIN         11    26    14    19    12
YUGOSLAVIA      6    12    24    19    19
CHI-SQUARE   48.8  70.7  55.6  68.3  65.8
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	(01)
2	(02)
3	(03)
4	(04)
9	(05+06+99)

ITEM 13 Mother's Education

```
BRAZIL          3    6   24    7   25   15   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         1    9    6   25   39    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        10    6   20   16   28    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           6   13   10   20   25    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           2    7   38    8   20    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          3   11   17    9   12   27   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0

CHICAGO        13   22   24   11    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         13   24   27   11    4    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      5    4   13   15   27   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 270.337 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     6
BRAZIL          3     6    24     7    25    15
ENGLAND         1     9     6    25    39     0
GERMANY        10     6    20    16    28     0
ITALY           6    13    10    20    25     6
JAPAN           2     7    38     8    20     5
MEXICO          3    11    17     9    12    27
CHICAGO        13    22    24    11     2     0
AUSTIN         13    24    27    11     4     3
YUGOSLAVIA      5     4    13    15    27    16
CHI-SQUARE   31.9  45.1  51.4  25.0  74.5  97.4
PROB.       .0002 .0000 .0000 .0019 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
(Same as Demographic code (country specific)	
1 University Graduate	(01
2 Some College	(02)
3 High School Graduate	(03)
4 Some High School	(04)
5 Eighth Grade Graduate	(05)
9	(06+93+99)

```
ITEM 14   Fatner's Education

BRAZIL          23     5    10     8    19    15     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         16    11     3     9    38     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         23     8    15    20    14     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           18    20     5     8    27     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           27    14     3    13    16     7     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          23     8    10     4    12    21     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         31     8    18    11     1     2     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          25    16    12    18     5     5     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      12     8    17    23     9    11     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 208.504 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     2     3     4     5     6
BRAZIL          23     5    10     8    19    15
ENGLAND         16    11     3     9    38     0
GERMANY         23     8    15    20    14     0
ITALY           18    20     5     8    27     2
JAPAN           27    14     3    13    16     7
MEXICO          23     8    10     4    12    21
CHICAGO         31     8    18    11     1     2
AUSTIN          25    16    12    18     5     5
YUGOSLAVIA      12     8    17    23     9    11
CHI-SQUARE    20.3  18.8  31.8  29.4  79.4  66.6
PROB.        .0095 .0161 .0002 .0005 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	University Graduate	(01)
2	Some College	(02)
3	High School Graduate	(03)
4	Some High School	(04)
5	Eighth Grade Graduate	(05)
6	Less than Eighth Grade	(06)
9		(99)

```
ITEM 15   Time in present house

BRAZIL          2     9    12    11     8    15    11    11     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         3     4     8    11     8     7    17    22     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           2     8    10     8    13     7    14    17     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           4     8     3     8     3     5    10    39     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          1     5     8     8     8    11    18    20     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         2     2    12     2    11    12    20    11     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          1     8    13    18    10     6     9    17     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      3     5     7     9    14     7    13    22     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 787.640 WITH 56 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY         3     4     5     6     7     8     9     0
BRAZIL          12    11     8    15    11    11     1    11
ENGLAND          8    11     8     7    17    22     0     7
GERMANY          0     0     0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY           10     8    13     7    14    17     1    10
JAPAN            3     8     3     5    10    39     0    12
MEXICO           8     8     8    11    18    20     0     6
CHICAGO         12     2    11    12    20    11     0     4
AUSTIN          13    18    10     6     9    17     0     9
YUGOSLAVIA       7     9    14     7    13    22     0     8
CHI-SQUARE    21.5  27.3  22.3  23.3  30.1  63.8 693.6  15.8
PROB.        .0063 .0009 .0048 .0034 .0004 .0000 .0000 .0451
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Less than one year	(01)
2	1-2 years	(02)
3	3-4 years	(03)
4	5-6 years	(04)
5	7-8 years	(05)
6	9-10 years	(06)
7	11-14 years	(07)
8	over 15 years	(08)
9		(99)

```
ITEM 16   Where else have you lived since X was born?

BRAZIL         20    27    16    16     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        29    40     9     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          35    27     9     8     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          40    21    12     7     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         27    30    13     8     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        19    42     9     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         23    27    14    17     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     21    36    10     3    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 670.657 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     2     3     4     5
BRAZIL          20    27    16    16     1
ENGLAND         29    40     9     2     0
GERMANY          0     0     0     0    80
ITALY           35    27     9     8     1
JAPAN           40    21    12     7     0
MEXICO          27    30    13     8     1
CHICAGO         19    42     9     2     0
AUSTIN          23    27    14    17     1
YUGOSLAVIA      21    36    10     3    10
CHI-SQUARE    60.9  74.9  18.3  44.7 602.0
PROB.        .0000 .0000 .0189 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	None	(00)
2	One	(01)
3	Two	(02)
4	Three or more	(03+04+05+06+07+08+09)
9	90's	(99)

```
17          INVALID.    Have there been any occasions when X has been away from home for six months or more?
      78        2      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      80        0      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      79        1      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      75        5      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      77        3      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      76        1      2     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      71        1      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      82        0      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
      69       11      0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0     -0   -0   -0
```

```
18          INVALID.    (If Yes)  How old was X then?
      1         0         2        77       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      1         0         0        79       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      0         0         1        79       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      3         2         2        73       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      2         1         0        77       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0

      0         1         2        76       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      0         0         0        72       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      0         0         0        82       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
      7         2         1        70       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0       -0  -0  -0
```

```
ITEM 19   Has X ever been in the  hospital?

BRAZIL         51    24     3     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        29    37    14     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        43    28     8     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          37    31    12     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          61    17     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         53    21     5     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        24    36    12     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         53    18    11     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     33    29    18     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  69.727 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3
BRAZIL         51    24     3
ENGLAND        29    37    14
GERMANY        43    28     8
ITALY          37    31    12
JAPAN          61    17     2
MEXICO         53    21     5
CHICAGO        24    36    12
AUSTIN         53    18    11
YUGOSLAVIA     33    29    18
CHI-SQUARE   57.9  28.3  27.8
PROB.       .0000 .0007 .0008
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 No admission	(00)
2 One admission	(01)
3 More than one admission	(02+03+04+05....)
9	(99)

```
ITEM 20A  For how Long?  a.  Total time for all admissions.

BRAZIL          4    16     5     0     1     0    54    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         0     8    15    14     6     8    29    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0    11    13     7     5    44    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           3    12     7    11     6     4    37    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           0     3     4     6     4     1    62    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          3    14     3     2     1     2    54    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         3    19     9     9     4     0    28    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          0    13     5     5     2     1    56    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      0     1     9    13    13    11    33    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 145.577 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        2     3     4     7     0
BRAZIL         16     5     0    54     5
ENGLAND         8    15    14    29    14
GERMANY         0    11    13    44    12
ITALY          12     7    11    37    13
JAPAN           3     4     6    62     5
MEXICO         14     3     2    54     6
CHICAGO        19     9     9    28     7
AUSTIN         13     5     5    56     3
YUGOSLAVIA      1     9    13    33    24
CHI-SQUARE   48.2  17.6  28.8  60.5  39.6
PROB.       .0000 .0240 .0006 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Less than one day	(01)
2 1-3 days	(02)
3 4-7 days	(03)
4 8-15 days	(04)
5 16-30 days	(05)
6 Over 30 days	(06+07)
9	(90's)

```
ITEM 21A  How old was X then?

BRAZIL         12     8     7    53    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        11    13    26    30    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         3    11    22    44    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           3    17    23    37    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           2     6    11    61    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          3    11    12    53    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         9    16    20    27    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          9     5    13    55    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     12    17    18    33    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  81.979 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4
BRAZIL         12     8     7    53
ENGLAND        11    13    26    30
GERMANY         3    11    22    44
ITALY           3    17    23    37
JAPAN           2     6    11    61
MEXICO          3    11    12    53
CHICAGO         9    16    20    27
AUSTIN          9     5    13    55
YUGOSLAVIA     12    17    18    33
CHI-SQUARE   22.9  18.6  25.8  55.6
PROB.       .0039 .0169 .0015 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 0-2 years	(00+01+02)
2 3-5 years	(03+04+05)
3 6 years and over	(06 through 16)
9	(93+97+99)

ITEM 22A Have there been any occasions when either parent has been living away from home regularly for 6 months or more? A. Both parents

```
BRAZIL        69    3    7    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       73    0    6    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       67    1   11    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         65    6    9    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         67    0   13    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        65    0   12    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       64    1    7    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        69    0   13    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    69    0   11    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =   5.639 WITH  8 DF.  P = .6894

CATEGORY       1     3
BRAZIL        69     7
ENGLAND       73     6
GERMANY       67    11
ITALY         65     9
JAPAN         67    13
MEXICO        65    12
CHICAGO       64     7
AUSTIN        69    13
YUGOSLAVIA    69    11
CHI-SQUARE   5.1   6.1
PROB.      .7463 .6366
```

Categories   Original Codes in Interview Manual

1 No for both (01)
2 Yes, mother (02)
3 Yes, father (03)
4 Yes, both (04)

```
22B        INVALID.   Mother only
     0        0        0        2        0        2       76      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        0        0        1        0        0       79      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        1        0        0        0        1       78      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        0        0        5        0        0       75      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        0        0        0        0        0       80      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     1        0        0        0        0        1       77      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        0        0        0        0        0       72      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        0        0        0        0        0       82      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
     0        0        0        0        0        0       80      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0      -0  -0  -0
```

ITEM 22C Father only

```
BRAZIL         2    4    0    1    0    1   72   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        2    1    1    1    0    2   73   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        3    6    0    1    0    2   68   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          0    9    1    0    0    0   70   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          0   12    0    1    0    1   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         6    8    0    0    0    0   65   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        0    5    0    1    0    0   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         0    3    3    5    0    2   69   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     1    7    2    1    0    0   69   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  14.468 WITH  8 DF.  P = .0699

CATEGORY       2     7
BRAZIL         4    72
ENGLAND        1    73
GERMANY        6    68
ITALY          9    70
JAPAN         12    66
MEXICO         8    65
CHICAGO        5    66
AUSTIN         3    69
YUGOSLAVIA     7    69
CHI-SQUARE  15.6   7.0
PROB.      .0478 .5367
```

Categories   Original Codes in Interview Manual

1 Marital separation or divorce (01)
2 Travel in work (02)
3 Military service (03)
4 Health (04)
5 Institutions, e.g., prisons (05)
6 Other reason (91)
9 (97+99)

ITEM 23 Now we would like to get some information regarding X. Please give me some words or phrases which you feel describe X in terms of his schoolwork.

```
BRAZIL        31   20    6   10    6    4    2    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       10    5    7    6    8    5   30    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       15   11   29    8   14    2    1    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         29   16   15   10    1    0    8    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         13    4   34   12    5    3    2    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        17   16   14    3    7    2   20    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       14    2   10    5   14    2   23    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        24    9    9    4   12    3   16    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    19    8   11    7   12    5   15    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 223.716 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     7     8
BRAZIL        31    20     6    10     6     2     5
ENGLAND       10     5     7     6     8    30    14
GERMANY       15    11    29     8    14     1     2
ITALY         29    16    15    10     1     8     1
JAPAN         13     4    34    12     5     2    10
MEXICO        17    16    14     3     7    20     2
CHICAGO       14     2    10     5    14    23     4
AUSTIN        24     9     9     4    12    16     8

YUGOSLAVIA    19     8    11     7    12    15     8
CHI-SQUARE  28.0  33.2  62.8  10.8  22.0  82.4  26.3
PROB.      .0007 .0002 .0000 .2139 .0052 .0000 .0013
```

Categories   Original Codes in Interview Manual

1 Positive achievement (01)
2 Ambivalent achievement (02)
3 Neutral achievement (03)
4 Negative achievement (04)
5 Positive affect + positive IPR (05+08)
6 Negative + neutral affect + negative IPR (06+07+09)
7 Other (91)

9 (93+97+99)

```
ITEM 24   How does X feel about school?

BRAZIL         29   38    7    1    3    1    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        20   27   10   10   11    1    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         7   50    7    7    8    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          10   23   11    3    8   25    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           5   47    7   17    3    1    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         11   30    2    9    8   18    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        11   38    7    6    5    2    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         14   46    5    7    6    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     25   45    5    2    3    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 215.771 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    5    6
BRAZIL         29   38    7    1    3    1
ENGLAND        20   27   10   10   11    1
GERMANY         7   50    7    7    8    0
ITALY          10   23   11    3    8   25
JAPAN           5   47    7   17    3    1
MEXICO         11   30    2    9    8   18
CHICAGO        11   38    7    6    5    2
AUSTIN         14   46    5    7    6    4
YUGOSLAVIA     25   45    5    2    3    0
CHI-SQUARE   44.2 37.0  9.3 30.0 11.3 124.4
PROB.       .0000 .0001 .3149 .0004 .1852 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Strong positive	(01)
2	Positive	(02)
3	Ambivalent	(03)
4	Neutral feelings	(04)
5	Negative + strong negative	(05+06)
6	Descriptive statement	(07)
9		(90,s)

```
ITEM 25   What makes him feel that way?

BRAZIL         21   14   15    8    1    5    4   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        11   21   10    9    9    2    0   18   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        30    3   17    7    2    1    3   17   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          17    2   10    7   28    6    6    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          13    3   33    5    0    1    4   21   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         25    5    8    1   18   14    2    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        20    7    7    5   10    0    9   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         20   15   16    8    3    5    3   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     29    2    3    4    3    3    3   33   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 259.423 WITH 48 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    5    8    0
BRAZIL         21   14   15    8    1   12    9
ENGLAND        11   21   10    9    9   18    2
GERMANY        30    3   17    7    2   17    4
ITALY          17    2   10    7   28    4   12
JAPAN          13    3   33    5    0   21    5
MEXICO         25    5    8    1   18    6   16
CHICAGO        20    7    7    5   10   14    9
AUSTIN         20   15   16    8    3   12    8
YUGOSLAVIA     29    2    3    4    3   33    6
CHI-SQUARE   22.5 52.4 53.2  8.6 95.8 47.7 21.2
PROB.       .0044 .0000 .0000 .3790 .0000 .0000 .0069
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Intrinsic values + academic subjects	(01+02)
2	Extracurricular activities + school environment	(03+06)
3	Social aspects	(04)
4	Teacher interaction	(05)
5	Personal characteristics	(07)
6	Self improvement	(08)
7	Other	(91)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 26A How do you think he does in school?  This question has a double code.  The first (A)  is an evaluation of the child's academic
                                                                                   performance.
BRAZIL         14   22   13   15    6    7    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        18    8   13   19    8   14    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         3   30   15   19    8    5    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           0   19   22   19   15    5    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           2    6    7   10    4    2   49    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         16   27    1   24    3    4    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        22   17    5   16    2    3    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         24   21    7   16    3    4    1    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     26   21    8   12   10    2    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 514.291 WITH 48 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    5    7    0
BRAZIL         14   22   13   15    6    0   10
ENGLAND        18    8   13   19    8    0   14
GERMANY         3   30   15   19    8    0    5
ITALY           0   19   22   19   15    0    5
JAPAN           2    6    7   10    4   49    2
MEXICO         16   27    1   24    3    3    5
CHICAGO        22   17    5   16    2    0   18
AUSTIN         24   21    7   16    3    1   10
YUGOSLAVIA     26   21    8   12   10    0    3
CHI-SQUARE   70.4 33.9 34.5 10.9 22.5 380.8 20.4
PROB.       .0000 .0001 .0001 .2064 .0044 .0000 .0091
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Excellent	(01)
2	Above average	(02)
3	Barely above average	(03)
4	Average	(04)
5	Below average	(05)
6	Poor work	(06)
7	Behavior rather than performance	(07)
9		(90's)

```
ITEM 26B (B)  Concerns the parent's satisfaction.

BRAZIL         60   16    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        41   21   18   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        44   23   13   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          28   35   17   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          71    6    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         30   44    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        54    7   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         62    9   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     36   36    8   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 131.928 WITH 16 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1    2    3
BRAZIL         60   16    4
ENGLAND        41   21   18
GERMANY        44   23   13
ITALY          28   35   17
JAPAN          71    6    3
MEXICO         30   44    5
CHICAGO        54    7   11
AUSTIN         62    9   11
YUGOSLAVIA     36   36    8
CHI-SQUARE   97.6 95.2 27.2
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0009
```

Categories

1 No direct indication of either satisfaction or lack of satisfaction
2 Parent indicates satisfaction with school achievement, positive affect
3 Parent indicates disatisfaction with school achievement, negative affect

ITEM 27 Do you do anything to encourage X in his schoolwork?

```
BRAZIL          16    10     4    38    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         12    21    17    23     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         26    35    13     6     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           19    20     3    28    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           20     2    11    39     8    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          14    13     8    28    16    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         10    18    21    17     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          12    17    16    26    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      13    13     9    40     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 134.525 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     2     3     4     5
BRAZIL          16    10     4    38    12
ENGLAND         12    21    17    23     7
GERMANY         26    35    13     6     0
ITALY           19    20     3    28    10
JAPAN           20     2    11    39     8
MEXICO          14    13     8    28    16
CHICAGO         10    18    21    17     6
AUSTIN          12    17    16    26    11
YUGOSLAVIA      13    13     9    40     5
CHI-SQUARE    15.2  50.0  32.9  52.9  22.3
PROB.        .0554 .0000 .0002 .0000 .0047
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No	(01)
2	Yes - Unspecified + homework only	(02+03)
3	Yes-academic support+ enriching actions	(04+05)
4	Yes - attitudinal	(06+07)
5	Direct action+material support+other+ irrelevant	(08+09+91+95)
9		(93+99)

ITEM 28 Have you met X's teacher? Yes, No, How did you meet?

```
BRAZIL          27     0     8    22     4    18     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND          4     1     4    63     0     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY          0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY            8     2    11     8     5    45     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN            5     0     2    49     9    15     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          22     3     4    16     3    27     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         11    10    12    32     0     6     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          17     3     2    44     8     6     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA       4     0     2    29    32    13     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 998.199 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     4     5     6     7     0
BRAZIL          27    22     4    18     1     8
ENGLAND          4    63     0     8     0     5
GERMANY          0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY            8     8     5    45     1    13
JAPAN            5    49     9    15     0     2
MEXICO          22    16     3    27     4     7
CHICAGO         11    32     0     6     1    22
AUSTIN          17    44     8     6     2     5
YUGOSLAVIA       4    29    32    13     0     2
CHI-SQUARE    71.6 176.3 127.8 118.8 633.3  64.0
PROB.        .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No	(01)
2	Yes-unspecified	(02)
3	School initiated	(03+04)
4	Formal routine occasions	(05)
5	Parent initiated	(06)
6	Parent initiated (non-formal)	(07)
9		(90,s)

ITEM 29 When X has homework what does he usually do?

```
BRAZIL           0    53     8    11     2     4     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND          0     5    19    20    21    15     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY          0     7    32    24     9     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY            0    13    33    17     2    13     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN            3    32    18    18     7     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO           0    24    10    31    11     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO          0    24    12    21     3    10     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN           2    22    15    16    10    16     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA       0    21    28    19     4     4     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 187.202 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         2     3     4     5     6
BRAZIL          53     8    11     2     4
ENGLAND          5    19    20    21    15
GERMANY          7    32    24     9     8
ITALY           13    33    17     2    13
JAPAN           32    18    18     7     2
MEXICO          24    10    31    11     3
CHICAGO         24    12    21     3    10
AUSTIN          22    15    16    10    16
YUGOSLAVIA      21    28    19     4     4
CHI-SQUARE   103.7  46.6  18.0  41.6  30.9
PROB.        .0000 .0000 .0211 .0000 .0003
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Does not have any	(01)
2	No reference to when done	(02)
3	High priority	(03)
4	At a regular time	(04)
5	Irregular time	(05)
6	Puts off+ does not do it + other	(06+07+91)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 30 How does he go about it?

```
BRAZIL         31     8     6     3     0    29     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        43    15    21     0     1     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        38    14     7    15     0     1     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          36    28     3     1     0     3     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          72     2     1     0     1     1     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         46     9     5     2    16     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        21    27     7     0    10     1     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         17    41    11     1     5     0     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     42    27     3     1     0     0     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 211.237 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     0
BRAZIL         31     8     6    35
ENGLAND        43    15    21     1
GERMANY        38    14     7    21
ITALY          36    28     3    13
JAPAN          72     2     1     5
MEXICO         46     9     5    19
CHICAGO        21    27     7    17
AUSTIN         17    41    11    13
YUGOSLAVIA     42    27     3     8
CHI-SQUARE   99.1  85.9  43.3  68.1
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Self-initiation	(01)
2	Self-other initiation	(02+03)
3	Other initiation	(04+05)
4	Affect (positive, neutral, negative)	(06+07+08)
5	Conditions	(09)
6	Other	(91)
9		(93+95+97+99)

ITEM 31 What do you do to see that X gets his homework done?

```
BRAZIL          8    32     2     7    22     6     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        12    16     9    28     7     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        36    10     1    20     5     1     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           1     4    16     5    52     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           9    13    14    36     4     1     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          2     9    12     8    44     3     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         8    17     0    34     4     9     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0

AUSTIN          9    14     7    35     4     8     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     29    27     1    20     0     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 435.810 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     0
BRAZIL          8    32     2     7    22     9
ENGLAND        12    16     9    28     7     8
GERMANY        36    10     1    20     5     8
ITALY           1     4    16     5    52     2
JAPAN           9    13    14    36     4     4
MEXICO          2     9    12     8    44     4
CHICAGO         8    17     0    34     4     9
AUSTIN          9    14     7    35     4    13
YUGOSLAVIA     29    27     1    20     0     3
CHI-SQUARE  104.5  49.1  47.4  83.5 235.9  17.1
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0293
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Nothing	(01)
2	Nothing - not necessary	(12)
3	Nothing - external pressure	(13+14+15)
4	Verbal reminder	(21+22+23)
5	Check or observe	(31+32+33)
6	Deprivation + active help + other	(41+51+91)
9		(93+95+97+99)

ITEM 32 How often does he put off his homework to do other things?

```
BRAZIL          4     8    12    13    41     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         2     8    12    31    27     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         1     7    15    27    29     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           1     2    16     7    53     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           5    14    14    27    15     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         13     8    17    25    16     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         4     9    12    25    21     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          2    15    17    31    16     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      1     4    19    21    30     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  85.687 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        2     3     4     5
BRAZIL          8    12    13    41
ENGLAND         8    12    31    27
GERMANY         7    15    27    29
ITALY           2    16     7    53
JAPAN          14    14    27    15
MEXICO          8    17    25    16
CHICAGO         9    12    25    21
AUSTIN         15    17    31    16
YUGOSLAVIA      4    19    21    30
CHI-SQUARE   18.1   3.8  32.5  70.7
PROB.       .0205 .8784 .0002 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Always	(11)
2	Frequently	(21+22+23)
3	Sometimes	(31+32+33+34+35+36)
4	Seldom	(41+42+43)
5	Never	(51)
9		(90,s)

ITEM 33 What would he do if he were nearly finished with his homework and he found that he had been doing it the wrong way?

```
BRAZIL        37   10    4    1    1    3    3    7   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       31    9    5    1    2    8   17    2    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       31   14   18    1    3    7    2    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         39   11    7    4    5    4    4    1    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         43    1    0    1    2    8    5    0   20   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        39    3   14    3    1    4    8    1    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       31   11    9    5    3    6    5    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        32   18   10    0    4    5    3    7    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    61    4    3    0    2    2    5    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 162.641 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     7     9     0
BRAZIL.       37    10     4     3    14    12
ENGLAND       31     9     5    17     5    13
GERMANY       31    14    18     2     1    14
ITALY         39    11     7     4     5    14
JAPAN         43     1     0     5    20    11
MEXICO        39     3    14     8     6     9
CHICAGO       31    11     9     5     2    14
AUSTIN        32    18    10     3     3    16
YUGOSLAVIA    61     4     3     5     3     4
CHI-SQUARE  35.6  29.6  36.6  30.7  51.9  10.5
PROB.      .0001 .0004 .0001 .0003 .0000 .2321
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Start over	(11)
2 Start over - unhappy	(21+22)
3 Start over - angry	(31+32)
4 Start over - pressure	(41)
5 Situational	(51)
6 Turn to others	(61)
7 Would not start over	(71)
8 Anxiety	(81)
9	(90's)

ITEM 34-1 WHAT DO YOU FEEL THE SCHOOL'S JOB OR RESPONSIBILITY IS?

```
BRAZIL        10   32   12    6    9    8    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        2   49   13    7    5    3    0    1   -0 - -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        3   55    5    7    9    1    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          6   25   21    4   12    6    0    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          3   32   25    0    5   14    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         5   13    4    1   11    2    0   43   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       12   42    5    5    4    4    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        10   46    1    9    3   11    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     0   49    5    3   21    0    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 406.201 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     5     8     0
BRAZIL        10    32    12     9     3    14
ENGLAND        2    49    13     5     1    10
GERMANY        3    55     5     9     0     8
ITALY          6    25    21    12     6    10
JAPAN          3    32    25     5     1    14
MEXICO         5    13     4    11    43     3
CHICAGO       12    42     5     4     0     9
AUSTIN        10    46     1     3     2    20
YUGOSLAVIA     0    49     6    21     2     3
CHI-SQUARE  28.1  74.9  61.2  31.2 259.2  25.3
PROB.      .0007.0000 .0000 .0003 .0000 .0017
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 School subjects + teach culture	(01+03)
2 To educate	(u2)
3 Instil values+teach ciscipline+ yuidance+yuilu character	(u4+u5+u8+u9) /
4 Learning	(06+07)
5 Preparation for life and job	(10+11)
6 Home role+limited contribution +other	(12+13+91)
7	(89)
9	(93+95+99)

ITEM 34-2 Same as Item 34-1

```
BRAZIL         2    6   12    1    7   12    9   31   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        0    4   25    4    4   12    0   31   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        1    5    9    8   12    3    7   35   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          6    9   21    3   11    1    0   29   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          0    3   18    0    1   10    2   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         1    1    4    0    3    3    4   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        0    0   10    0    7    9    1   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         3    2   19    4    6   15    0   33   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     0    6   17    2    7    2    0   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 128.669 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       3     5     6     8     0
BRAZIL        12     7    12    31    18
ENGLAND       25     4    12    31     8
GERMANY        9    12     3    35    21
ITALY         21    11     1    29    18
JAPAN         18     1    10    46     5
MEXICO         4     3     3    63     6
CHICAGO       10     7     9    45     1
AUSTIN        19     6    15    33     9
YUGOSLAVIA    17     7     2    46     8
CHI-SQUARE  27.6  16.9  31.9  54.6  40.1

PROB.      .0008 .0306 .0002 .0000 .0000
```

ITEM 34-3 Same as 34-1

```
BRAZIL         2    0    4    0    2    5    0   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        0    1    4    1    1    6    0   65   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        0    0    0    0    2    2    0   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          1    0    8    0    5    3    0   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          0    1    2    0    0    3    0   73   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         0    0    1    0    1    1    0   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        0    0    3    0    1    2    0   65   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         0    0   11    1    3    8    0   59   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     0    0    3    1    0    0    0   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  42.567 WITH  8 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       8     0
BRAZIL        63    13
ENGLAND       65    13
GERMANY       76     4
ITALY         63    17
JAPAN         73     6
MEXICO        76     3
CHICAGO       65     6
AUSTIN        59    23
YUGOSLAVIA    76     4
CHI-SQUARE  42.6  42.6
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	School subjects + teach culture	(01+03)
2	To educate	(02)
3	Instil values+teach discipline+guidance+ build character	(04+05+08+09)
4	Learning	(06+07)
5	Preparation for life and job	(10+11)
6	Home role+limited contribution+other	(12+13+91)
7		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 35 How important do you think school is?

```
BRAZIL        30   42    7    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       22   54    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       49   25    6    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         32   34   14    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         53   19    8    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        34   41    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       26   44    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        28   50    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    28   44    8    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  68.419 WITH 16 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3
BRAZIL        30    42     7
ENGLAND       22    54     4
GERMANY       49    25     6
ITALY         32    34    14
JAPAN         53    19     8
MEXICO        34    41     4
CHICAGO       26    44     2
AUSTIN        28    50     3
YUGOSLAVIA    28    44     8
CHI-SQUARE  43.8  53.5  17.7
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0233
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Most important	(01)
2	Very important	(02)
3	Important	(03)
4	Unimportant	(04)
9		(90.s)

ITEM 36 Why?

```
BRAZIL         7    9   13   40    7    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       21    4   18   28    6    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        8   15    7   43    3    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         16    5   27   25    2    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          5    4   20   24   26    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         1    2   17   54    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       21    7    8   29    4    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        24    3   17   31    3    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    22    7    3   38    1    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 199.002 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5
BRAZIL         7     9    13    40     7
ENGLAND       21     4    18    28     6
GERMANY        8    15     7    43     3
ITALY         16     5    27    25     2
JAPAN          5     4    20    24    26
MEXICO         1     2    17    54     0
CHICAGO       21     7     8    29     4
AUSTIN        24     3    17    31     3
YUGOSLAVIA    22     7     3    38     1
CHI-SQUARE  53.5  22.0  36.0  39.7  92.1
PROB.      .0000 .0052 .0001 .0000 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Socioeconomic reasons	(01)
2	Academic reasons	(02)
3	Personal+social development	(03+04)
4	Preparation for life	(05)
5	Other	(91)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 37 How far would you like your child to go in school?

```
BRAZIL        47    0   17    5   11    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       24    5   23   17   11    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       31   29    8    9    3    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         43   23    5    1    6    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         53    6   16    3    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        52    8   10    2    6    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       51    5    7    0    9    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        70    5    3    0    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    44    1   16   10    8    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 204.109 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     5     0
BRAZIL        47     0    17    11     5
ENGLAND       24     5    23    11    17
GERMANY       31    29     8     3     9
ITALY         43    23     5     6     3
JAPAN         53     6    16     2     3
MEXICO        52     8    10     6     3
CHICAGO       51     5     7     9     0
AUSTIN        70     5     3     4     0
YUGOSLAVIA    44     1    16     8    11
CHI-SQUARE  73.2  97.6  34.5  15.1  47.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0001 .0567 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	University Graduate	(01)
2	Some college	(02)
3	High School graduate	(03)
4	Remaining educational groupings	(04+05+06+91)
5	Child's preference and development	(07+08)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 38   How far do you think he really will go in school?

```
BRAZIL        29    4   16   18    6    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       17    2   18   26    1   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       28   21    7   10    7    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         35   23    7    4    9    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         48    5   21    3    1    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        38   11   13    4    9    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       40    5   13    2    1   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        57   12    9    1    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    28    1   19   17   13    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 196.559 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     6
BRAZIL        29     4    16    18     7
ENGLAND       17     2    18    26    16
GERMANY       28    21     7    10     7
ITALY         35    23     7     4     2
JAPAN         48     5    21     3     2
MEXICO        38    11    13     4     4
CHICAGO       40     5    13     2    11
AUSTIN        57    12     9     1     3
YUGOSLAVIA    28     1    19    17     2
CHI-SQUARE  58.0  62.0  19.3  74.4  35.4
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0134 .0000 .0001
```

See Item 37 Both these questions have the same oroginal codes as the demographic and are therefore country specific.

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	University graduate	(01)
2	Some college	(02)
3	High School graduate	(03)
4	Remaining educational groupings	(04+05+06+91)
5	Child's preference and development	(07+08)
9		(93+95+99)

We are also interested in what children do outside of school; how they spend their time, their activities, how much time they they spend around adults, how much with the family ,etc.

ITEM 39   When he is not in school, what kinds of things does X do?

```
BRAZIL         0   10   13   19   17   21    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        0    3    5   13   18   25   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        1    9   15   25   18   12    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          1   13   26   20    9   10    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          0   10   27   28   12    3    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         1   13   21   24   16    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        1   10   14   27   11    9    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         1    2    7   22   17   32    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     1   11   23   24   11   10    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 112.700 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2     3     4     5     6
BRAZIL        10    13    19    17    21
ENGLAND        3     5    13    18    25
GERMANY        9    15    25    18    12
ITALY         13    26    20     9    10
JAPAN         10    27    28    12     3
MEXICO        13    21    24    16     4
CHICAGO       10    14    27    11     9
AUSTIN         2     7    22    17    32
YUGOSLAVIA    11    23    24    11    10
CHI-SQUARE  16.1  38.0  12.4   7.7  63.8
PROB.      .0401 .0000 .1319 .5375 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No activities	(00)
2	One activity	(01)
3	Two activities	(02)
4	Three activities	(03)
5	Four activities	(04)
6	Five or more activities	(05+06+07+08+09+ 10+11)
9		(93+99)

ITEM 40A-1   What kinds of things does he do with you:

```
BRAZIL         8   22   34    4    7    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        6   37   21   15    0    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       19   39   18    2    0    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          7   14   18   16    8    0   17   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          5   35   25   15    0    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        11   19   33    3   10    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        6   34   12    8    2    0   10   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         6   41   24    6    2    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    15    5   51    3    5    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 201.119 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     0
BRAZIL         8    22    34     4    12
ENGLAND        6    37    21    15     1
GERMANY       19    39    18     2     2
ITALY          7    14    18    16    25
JAPAN          5    35    25    15     0
MEXICO        11    19    33     3    13
CHICAGO        6    34    12     8    12
AUSTIN         6    41    24     6     5
YUGOSLAVIA    15     5    51     3     6
CHI-SQUARE  22.4  73.0  59.1  37.0  67.9
PROB.      .0045 .0000 .0000 .0001 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Verbal activity	(01)
2	Non-verbal activity+positive affect	(02+03)
3	Constructive activity	(04)
4	Negative affect	(05)
5	Neutral responses+other	(06+91)
6		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 40A-2    See Item 40A-1

BRAZIL         4    8    6    0    1   21   40   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        0    6    8    0    0   17   49   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        8   17    3    0    0   27   25   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          2    3    2    0    1    0   72   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          5   14    6    0    0   10   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         1    9    7    0    1   13   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        3   10    6    1    0   13   39   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         4   15    7    0    0   21   35   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     7    3   11    0    0   11   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  92.363 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2     3     6     7
BRAZIL         8     6    21    40
ENGLAND        6     8    17    49
GERMANY       17     3    27    25
ITALY          3     2     0    72
JAPAN         14     6    10    45
MEXICO         9     7    13    48
CHICAGO       10     6    13    39
AUSTIN        15     7    21    35
YUGOSLAVIA     3    11    11    48
CHI-SQUARE  24.4   9.6  39.9  66.8
PROB.      .0023 .2939 .0000 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Verbal Activity	(01)
2	Non-verbal activity+positive affect	(02+03)
3	Constructive activity	(04)
4	Negative affect	(05)
5	Neutral responses+other	(06+91)
6		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 40B-1    What kinds of things does he do with you?

BRAZIL        37    8    7   12    8    3    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       27    6   10   19    2   15    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0

GERMANY       11   20   26   18    1    2    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         21    5   16    5    0   19    0   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         27    5   22    7    4   15    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        41   10   11    1    1   10    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       20    8   15   11    2    5    0   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        35    6    7   23    2    7    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    51   15    5    1    0    8    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 201.905 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     6     0
BRAZIL        37     8     7    12     3    13
ENGLAND       27     6    10    19    15     3
GERMANY       11    20    26    18     2     3
ITALY         21     5    16     5    19    14
JAPAN         27     5    22     7    15     4
MEXICO        41    10    11     1    10     6
CHICAGO       20     8    15    11     5    13
AUSTIN        35     6     7    23     7     4
YUGOSLAVIA    51    15     5     1     8     0
CHI-SQUARE  61.2  25.5  37.9  53.2  32.9  38.1
PROB.      .0000 .0016 .0000 .0000 .0002 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Household activities	(01)
2	Conversation	(02)
3	Indoor activities+homework	(03+06+07)
4	Church+outings	(04+05)
5	Everything +other	(08+91)
6	Absence of Interaction	(09)
7		(89)
9		(95+99)

```
ITEM 40B-2    Same as Item 40B-1

BRAZIL         2    3    9    5    0    0   20   41   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        7    0    7    5    0    0   11   50   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        2    8   18   16    0    0   10   26   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          0    0    5    6    0    0    0   69   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          6    3    7    1    0    0   18   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         9    2    2    3    1    0   14   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        4    2    0   12    0    0   14   40   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         5    3    8   10    0    0   21   35   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    10    5   12    0    0    0    9   44   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 133.159 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       3     4     7     8     0
BRAZIL         9     5    20    41     5
ENGLAND        7     5    11    50     7
GERMANY       18    16    10    26    10
ITALY          5     6     0    69     0
JAPAN          7     1    18    45     9
MEXICO         2     3    14    48    12
CHICAGO        0    12    14    40     6
AUSTIN         8    10    21    35     8
YUGOSLAVIA    12     0     9    44    15
CHI-SQUARE  31.8  38.8  30.7  56.4  20.2
PROB.      .0002 .0000 .0003 .0000 .0098
```

ITEM 40B-3 Same as 40B-1

```
BRAZIL         0     1     3     4     3     0     7    62    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        0     1     0     0     1     0     2    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        1     2     8     5     0     0     8    56    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          0     1     0     1     0     0     0    78    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          0     1     3     4     0     1     3    68    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         2     1     1     4     0     0     5    66    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        1     0     3     0     0     0     8    68    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         3     3     4     8     0     0     8    56    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     1     2     5     1     0     0     6    65    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  42.815 WITH  8 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       4     6
BRAZIL        62    18
ENGLAND       76     4
GERMANY       56    24
ITALY         78     2
JAPAN         68    12
MEXICO        66    13
CHICAGO       68    12
AUSTIN        56    26
YUGOSLAVIA    65    15
CHI-SQUARE  42.8  42.8
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Household activities	(01)
2	Conversation	(02)
3	Indoor activities+homework	(03+06+07)
4	Church + outings	(04+05)
5	Everything + other	(08+91)
6	Absence of Interaction	(09)
7		(89)
9		(95+99)

ITEM 40C What kinds of things does he do with you?

```
BRAZIL        10    28    18    20     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       15    33    24     6     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        2    20    28    28     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY         24    41    11     4     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         15    30    24    11     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        12    32    19    13     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        6    23    28    13    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         8    24    22    27     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     8    21    24    27     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  87.026 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4
BRAZIL        10    28    18    20
ENGLAND       15    33    24     6
GERMANY        2    20    28    28
ITALY         24    41    11     4
JAPAN         15    30    24    11
MEXICO        12    32    19    13
CHICAGO        6    23    28    13
AUSTIN         8    24    22    27
YUGOSLAVIA     8    21    24    27
CHI-SQUARE  33.2  19.5  12.1  50.3
PROB.      .0002 .0125 .1477 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No activities	(00)
2	One activity	(01)
3	Two activities	(02)
4	Three or more activities	(03)
9		(99)

ITEM 41A-1 What kinds of things does he do with his father/mother?

```
BRAZIL        32     7    12    17     2     0    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       33     5    20    19     0     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY       48    14    12     3     0     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY         23    17     4    27     1     0     8    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         44     6     8    20     2     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        16    11    16    26     2     0     8    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       43     3     7     7     0     0    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        51     3    15     5     2     0     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    17    18    27    16     1     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 163.922 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     7
BRAZIL        32     7    12    17    10
ENGLAND       33     5    20    19     3
GERMANY       48    14    12     3     3
ITALY         23    17     4    27     8
JAPAN         44     6     8    20     0
MEXICO        16    11    16    26     8
CHICAGO       43     3     7     7    12
AUSTIN        51     3    15     5     6
YUGOSLAVIA    17    18    27    16     1
CHI-SQUARE  73.8  32.3  34.4  48.2  28.4
PROB.      .0000 .0002 .0001 .0000 .0006
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Non-verbal activity+positive affect	(01+03)
2	Verbal activity	(02)
3	Constructive activity	(04)
4	Negative or lack of interaction	(05+06)
5	Neutral+other	(07+91)
6		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 41A-2    Same as Item 41A-1

BRAZIL        11    4    4    2    1   17   41   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        6    1    6    0    0   15   52   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       19    5    3    0    0   21   32   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          2    1    1    0    0    1   75   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          4    5    1    0    1   23   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         4    5    0    0    0    7   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        4    1    5    0    0   17   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         4    3    7    0    0   32   36   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    12    8    4    0    0    1   55   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 128.408 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     6     7     0
BRAZIL        11    17    41    11
ENGLAND        6    15    52     7
GERMANY       19    21    32     8
ITALY          2     1    75     2
JAPAN          4    23    46     7
MEXICO         4     7    63     5
CHICAGO        4    17    45     6
AUSTIN         4    32    36    10
YUGOSLAVIA    12     1    55    12
CHI-SQUARE  36.1  68.9  79.4  10.9
PROB.      .0001 .0000 .0000 .2083
```

Categories

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Non-verbal activity+positive affect	(01+03)
2	Verbal activity	(02)
3	Constructive activity	(04)
4	Negative or lack of interaction	(05+06)
5	Neutral+other	(07+91)
6		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 41B-1    What kinds of things does he do with his father/mother?

BRAZIL         5   11    8   22   21    3   10   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       13    5   13   26    2   18    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        2   14   28   31    1    2    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          5   12   14   14    0   26    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          6    6   29   18    2   19    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        12   11    7   14    0   28    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        8    3   10   32    1    6   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        13    3    9   43    2    5    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    13   16   28    4    3   15    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 207.829 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     6     7
BRAZIL         5    11     8    22     3    10
ENGLAND       13     5    13    26    18     3

GERMANY        2    14    28    31     2     2
ITALY          5    12    14    14    26     9
JAPAN          6     6    29    18    19     0
MEXICO        12    11     7    14    28     7
CHICAGO        8     3    10    32     6    12
AUSTIN        13     3     9    43     5     7
YUGOSLAVIA    13    16    28     4    15     1
CHI-SQUARE  18.8  22.7  52.7  69.0  69.4  30.2
PROB.      .0162 .0041 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0004
```

Categories
=Same as Item 40B-1

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Household activities	(01)
2	2Conversation	(02)
3	Indoor activities+homework	(03+06+07)
4	Church + outings	(04+05)
5	Everything + other	(08+91)
6	Absence of Interaction	(09)
7		(89)
9		(95+99)

```
ITEM 41B-2    What kinds of things does he do with his father/mother?

BRAZIL         0    3    8    5    5    1   13   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        5    2    8    1    2    0   10   52   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        2    4   18   14    0    0   10   32   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          0    0    3    3    0    0    1   73   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          1    4    9    5    0    0   15   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         0    5    2    4    0    0    5   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        2    1    5    6    1    0   15   42   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         9    4    6    7    0    0   20   36   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3   10    9    5    0    0    0   53   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 124.667 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       3     4     7     8     0
BRAZIL         8     5    13    45     9
ENGLAND        8     1    10    52     9
GERMANY       18    14    10    32     6
ITALY          3     3     1    73     0
JAPAN          9     5    15    46     5
MEXICO         2     4     5    63     5
CHICAGO        5     6    15    42     4
AUSTIN         6     7    20    36    13
YUGOSLAVIA     9     5     0    53    13
CHI-SQUARE  24.8  20.0  42.5  70.6  21.5
PROB.      .0020 .0104 .0000 .0000 .0063
```

Categories

Same as Item 40B-1

```
ITEM 41C   What kinds of things does he do with his father/mother?

BRAZIL          17    18    21    14    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         18    31    17    11     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY          3    26    26    24     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           28    35    16     1     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           19    27    28     5     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          27    28    10     7     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO          7    25    15    14    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN           9    22    32    14     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      16    33    20    10     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  89.292 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     2     3     4
BRAZIL          17    18    21    14
ENGLAND         18    31    17    11
GERMANY          3    26    26    24
ITALY           28    35    16     1
JAPAN           19    27    28     5
MEXICO          27    28    10     7

CHICAGO          7    25    15    14
AUSTIN           9    22    32    14
YUGOSLAVIA      16    33    20    10
CHI-SQUARE    44.1  12.7  23.2  36.9
PROB.        .0000 .1212 .0035 .0001
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No activities	(00)
2	One activity	(01)
3	Two activities	(02)
4	Three or more activities	(03)
9		(99)

```
ITEM 42   What kinds of things does he do with the family?

BRAZIL           8    14    10     6     3    32     0     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND          1     5    14     6    30    22     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY          0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           10    20    10     3     0    13    13    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN            6     9    28    11     2    11    10     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          10     5    17     5     0    22    17     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO          2     2     5     5    14    38     4     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN           2     3     6     9     0    52     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA       5    30    10     2     1    24     5     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 824.893 WITH 48 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY         2     3     5     6     7     8     0
BRAZIL          14    10     3    32     0     7    14
ENGLAND          5    14    30    22     1     1     7
GERMANY          0     0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY           20    10     0    13    13    11    13
JAPAN            9    28     2    11    10     3    17
MEXICO           5    17     0    22    17     3    15
CHICAGO          2     5    14    38     4     2     7
AUSTIN           3     6     8    52     0     2    11
YUGOSLAVIA      30    10     1    24     5     3     7
CHI-SQUARE    89.2  53.2 136.6 117.1  62.3 490.8  25.1
PROB.        .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0019
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Household activities+nothing in particular	(01+08)
2	Indoor activities	(02)
3	T.V. Listening to music	(03)
4	Religious+visiting relatives+other	(04+07+91)
5	Vacations	(05)
6	Outings	(06)
7	Absence of interaction	(09)
9		(95+99+97)

```
ITEM 43-1   Does he belong to any clubs, organizations, or groups?

BRAZIL           3    36     5    31     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         34     5    11    30     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY          9    30     4    37     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           24     5     4    46     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN            3     1    10    66     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO           2    23     1    53     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         29     7    15    21     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          30    10    19    21     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA       6    11    12    51     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 258.222 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     2     3     4
BRAZIL           3    36     5    31
ENGLAND         34     5    11    30
GERMANY          9    30     4    37
ITALY           24     5     4    46
JAPAN            3     1    10    66
MEXICO           2    23     1    53
CHICAGO         29     7    15    21
AUSTIN          30    10    19    21
YUGOSLAVIA       6    11    12    51
CHI-SQUARE   117.6 103.3  35.9  92.4

PROB.        .0000 .0000 .0001 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Organized groups	(01)
2	Sports Clubs	(02)
3	Other groups and clubs	(03+04+05+06+07+91)
4	None	(08)
5		(89)
9		(95+99)

```
ITEM 43-2   Same as Item 43-1

BRAZIL          1    2    7    0    9   61   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         1    5   10    0    5   59   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         1    3    1    0    2   73   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           0    0    0    0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           0    0    1    0    0   79   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          2    1    0    0    3   73   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         5    5   12    0    5   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN          5    7   20    0    5   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      1    3    1    0    0   75   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 129.072 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        3    6    0
BRAZIL          7   61   12
ENGLAND        10   59   11
GERMANY         1   73    6
ITALY           0   80    0
JAPAN           1   79    0
MEXICO          0   73    6
CHICAGO        12   45   15
AUSTIN         20   45   17
YUGOSLAVIA      1   75    4
CHI-SQUARE   73.7 119.2  44.6
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Organized groups1	(01)
2	Sports clubs	(02)
3	Other groups and clubs	(03+04+05+06+07+91)
4	None	(08)
5		(89)
9		(95+99)

```
ITEM 44-1    Does he have any hobbies, lessons, or classes?

BRAZIL         21   12    6    7    3   28    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        16   11   21    9    5   18    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        25   10   13    8    5   19    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          14    3    5   11    1   45    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          28   25    6    4   13    4    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         10   11   19    4    3   32    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        37    0    8   11    2   13    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         25    0   12   15    7   21    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     24    5   11    9    6   24    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 179.908 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1    2    3    4    6    0
BRAZIL         21   12    6    7   28    6
ENGLAND        16   11   21    9   18    5
GERMANY        25   10   13    8   19    5
ITALY          14    3    5   11   45    2
JAPAN          28   25    6    4    4   13
MEXICO         10   11   19    4   32    3
CHICAGO        37    0    8   11   13    3
AUSTIN         25    0   12   15   21    9
YUGOSLAVIA     24    5   11    9   24    7
CHI-SQUARE   38.5  62.5  26.8  12.8  65.6  16.5
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0011 .1196 .0000 .0352
```

Categories

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Cultural	(01)
2	Academic	(02)
3	Sport	(03)
4	Intellectual recreation	(04)
5	Domestic vocational+other	(05+91)
6	None	(06)
7		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 44-2   Same as Item 44-1

BRAZIL          4    1    4    1    5    0    9   56   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         6   10    5    5    6    0   17   31   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         9    2    7    3    6    0    8   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           2    0    4    2    0    0    0   72   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           6   12    9   12    6    0   16   19   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          3    5    6    1    1    0    8   55   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         5    0    4    1    3    0   11   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN          6    0    8    4    7    0    6   51   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      4    4    3    4    2    0    1   62   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 126.417 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        3    7    8    0
BRAZIL          4    9   56   11
ENGLAND         5   17   31   27
GERMANY         7    8   45   20
ITALY           4    0   72    4
JAPAN           9   16   19   36
MEXICO          6    8   55   10
CHICAGO         4   11   48    9
AUSTIN          8    6   51   17
YUGOSLAVIA      3    1   62   14
CHI-SQUARE    6.2  36.4 108.2  58.8
PROB.       .6302 .0001 .0000 .0000
```

```
ITEM 45    When you want X to do something, how do you go about getting him to do it?

BRAZIL        17    41     5    16     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        5    62     9     4     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        8    44     5    23     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          8    54    14     4     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         13    56     2     9     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         0    41     1    37     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        7    38     3    23     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         7    37    11    24     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3    38     9    28     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 118.572 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4
BRAZIL        17    41     5    16
ENGLAND        5    62     9     4
GERMANY        8    44     5    23
ITALY          8    54    14     4
JAPAN         13    56     2     9
MEXICO         0    41     1    37
CHICAGO        7    38     3    23
AUSTIN         7    37    11    24
YUGOSLAVIA     3    38     9    28
CHI-SQUARE  29.5  33.1  24.8  73.0
PROB.      .0005 .0002 .0020 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Simple presentation+rational explanation+other	(01+02+91)
2	Mild request	(03)
3	Strong request	(04)
4	Order or demand	(05+06)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 46    How does he respond to this?

BRAZIL        34     9    15    14     5     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0

ENGLAND       22    33    17     5     2     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY       45     8    13    14     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY         30    22    13    10     5     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         40    11    14     7     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        38    15    17     3     5     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       22    24    12     3    10     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        24    29    15     6     5     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    30     4    26    15     4     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 109.399 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     0
BRAZIL        34     9    15    14     8
ENGLAND       22    33    17     5     3
GERMANY       45     8    13    14     0
ITALY         30    22    13    10     5
JAPAN         40    11    14     7     8
MEXICO        38    15    17     3     6
CHICAGO       22    24    12     3    11
AUSTIN        24    29    15     6     8
YUGOSLAVIA    30     4    26    15     5
CHI-SQUARE  26.7  62.3  10.5  23.4  16.6
PROB.      .0011 .0000 .2322 .0033 .0339
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Does it	(01)
2	Does it eventually	(02)
3	Situational	(03)
4	Complains+emotional response	(04+05)
5	Procrastinates+refuses	(06+07+08+91)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 47    What follow-up is needed to see that he does it?

BRAZIL        46    19     6     0     7     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       38    16    16     2     3     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY         29    22     5    15     5     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         33    24    10     5     6     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        20    50     2     2     2     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       23    26    10     3     7     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        14    35    17     6     3     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    32     9    22    12     1     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 625.632 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     6     0
BRAZIL        46    19     6     2     7
ENGLAND       38    16    16     5     5
GERMANY        0     0     0    80     0
ITALY         29    22     5     4    20
JAPAN         33    24    10     2    11
MEXICO        20    50     2     3     4
CHICAGO       23    26    10     3    10
AUSTIN        14    35    17     7     9
YUGOSLAVIA    32     9    22     4    13
CHI-SQUARE  85.0 105.1  49.6 495.7  34.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0090 .0000 .0001
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Nothing	(01+02)
2	Remind or explain	1 (03+04)
3	Nag + emotional appeal	(05+06)
4	Reward or punishment	(07+08)
5	Other	(91)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 48   If you see that he is not doing a job the right way, what do you do?

```
BRAZIL          5    28    13    20    10     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         6    65     3     4     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         1    59    12     6     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           2    47     8    20     2     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           4    46    13    14     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0

MEXICO          1    36     4    32     4     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         4    52     8     1     5     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          7    41    17     4     7     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      1    63     3     9     4     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 146.433 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        2     3     4     0
BRAZIL         28    13    20    19
ENGLAND        65     3     4     8
GERMANY        59    12     6     3
ITALY          47     8    20     5
JAPAN          46    13    14     7
MEXICO         36     4    32     7
CHICAGO        52     8     1    11
AUSTIN         41    17     4    20
YUGOSLAVIA     63     3     9     5
CHI-SQUARE   69.2  24.5  79.0  35.3
PROB.       .0000 .0023 .0000 .0001
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Doesn't happen	(01)
2	Demonstrate	(02)
3	Maintainance of standard of performance	(03)
4	Bawl out	(04)
5	Punish or parent does it+other	(05+06+91)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 49   How does he react to this?

```
BRAZIL         17     5    19     2    13     0     7     9     8    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        25     7     6     8     6     2     0    20     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        17    22    11     1    10     3     1    10     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          20    10    20     4     8     3     5     9     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           4    27     3     3     4     4     8    22     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         18     7     8     1    22     3     8    11     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        10    14    20     2     9     4     2     8     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         21    11     8     0     9     7     5    11    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     27     5    15     6     4     2     3    16     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 140.816 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     5     8     0
BRAZIL         17     5    19    13     9    17
ENGLAND        25     7     6     6    20    16
GERMANY        17    22    11    10    10    10
ITALY          20    10    20     8     9    13
JAPAN           4    27     3     4    22    20
MEXICO         18     7     8    22    11    13
CHICAGO        10    14    20     9     8    11
AUSTIN         21    11     8     9    11    22
YUGOSLAVIA     27     5    15     4    16    13
CHI-SQUARE   27.5  47.5  35.1  29.7  18.7   9.4
PROB.       .0008 .0000 .0001 .0004 .0165 .3061
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Positive acceptance	(01)
2	Neutral acceptance	(02)
3	Negative acceptance	(03)
4	Refusal	(04)
5	Emotional reaction only	(05)
6	Rationalizes	(06)
7	No reaction + other	(07+91)
8	Situational	(08)
9		(93+95+97+99)

ITEM 50A-1   What jobs or chores does he have around the house?   A. Job or chores, Demographic code, score first two responses.

```
BRAZIL          5    12    13     5     3     9    13    20     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        11    16    11     7     8     8    16     3     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         1    30    13     5     6    14     6     5     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           1     1     1     3     0     2    70     1     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           2     2    18     8     5    37     6     2     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          9     1     7    13     5    28    15     0     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         2    10    38     0    17     1     4     0     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          7    13    34     7    20     0     0     0     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     12    10    15    11     2    17    10     3     0     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0

TABLE C2 = 540.212 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     6     7
BRAZIL          5    12    13     5     3     9    13
ENGLAND        11    16    11     7     8     8    16
GERMANY         1    30    13     5     6    14     6
ITALY           1     1     1     3     0     2    70
JAPAN           2     2    18     8     5    37     6
MEXICO          9     1     7    13     5    28    15
CHICAGO         2    10    38     0    17     1     4
AUSTIN          7    13    34     7    20     0     0
YUGOSLAVIA     12    10    15    11     2    17    10
CHI-SQUARE   28.7  72.5  95.3  20.0  57.4 118.2 280.7
PROB.       .0006 .0000 .0000 .0106 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Bed making	(01)
02	Dishwashing	(02)
03	Cleaning house	(04)
04	Washing windows, laundry, shoe cleaning cooking, caring for children	(03+05+07+10+11)
05	Car washing, gardening, pets	(06+08+09)
06	General help (shopping)	(12+16)
07	Seldom or never helps	(13+14+15)
08	Other	(91)
09		(89)
99		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 50A-2    Same as Item 50A-1

BRAZIL          0     1     9    10     2     2     0    16    13    27    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        10     6     9    11     6     5     0     2     0    31    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         3    11     8     7     6    11     0     4     7    23    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           0     1     0     0     0     1     0     0     0    78    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           1     0     6    12     4    19     0     1     8    29    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          3     1     7    16     2     7     1     0    13    29    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         0    12    21    11    12     0     0     0     7     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          4    16    24    15    14     3     0     0     2     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      4     7    14    21     1     6     1     1     0    25    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 350.939 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        2     3     4     6     9    10     0
BRAZIL          1     9    10     2    13    27    18
ENGLAND         6     9    11     5     0    31    18
GERMANY        11     8     7    11     7    23    13
ITALY           1     0     0     1     0    78     0
JAPAN           0     6    12    19     8    29     6
MEXICO          1     7    16     7    13    29     6
CHICAGO        12    21    11     0     7     9    12
AUSTIN         16    24    15     3     2     4    18
YUGOSLAVIA      7    14    21     6     0    25     7
CHI-SQUARE   49.1  50.8  28.1  49.9  44.3 186.6  35.5
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0007 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0001
```

```
ITEM 50B   / What jobs or chores does he have around the house?  Context in which chore is performed.

BRAZIL          4    53    14     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         7    20    40    13    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         2    57    16     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           0     5     2    73    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           4    61     9     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          6    51    10    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         1    20    47     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          4    23    54     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      7    38    29     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 462.472 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        2     3     4
BRAZIL         53    14     9

ENGLAND        20    40    13
GERMANY        57    16     5
ITALY           5     2    73
JAPAN          61     9     6
MEXICO         51    10    12
CHICAGO        20    47     4
AUSTIN         23    54     1
YUGOSLAVIA     38    29     6
CHI-SQUARE  159.6 169.4 335.2
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Personal items only	(01)
2	Family only	(02)
3	Personal and family	(03)
9		(90,s)

```
ITEM 51    What are the reasons for his having them?

BRAZIL         37     8     3     4    15     1     1    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        23     8    12    10     3     3     5    16    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           4     0     0     0     0     0     2    74    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          11    30     1     6    11     1     0    20    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          6     2    25    21     1     7     4    13    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        19     9    20     5     0     9     0    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         13     7    27    12     1    13     3     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     25     7     6    27     5     0     3     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 600.175 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     8     0
BRAZIL         37     8     3     4    11    17
ENGLAND        23     8    12    10    16    11
GERMANY         0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY           4     0     0     0    74     2
JAPAN          11    30     1     6    20    12
MEXICO          6     2    25    21    13    12
CHICAGO        19     9    20     5    10     9
AUSTIN         13     7    27    12     6    17
YUGOSLAVIA     25     7     6    27     7     8
CHI-SQUARE   90.1  91.1 107.8  81.6 378.4  31.3
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0003
```

Categories

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Help parents	(01)
2	Has to be done	(02)
3	Teach responsibility	(03)
4	Learns skills	(04)
5	Wants to do it	(05)
6	Share with family	(06)
7	Keep child occupied	(07)
9		(90,s)

```
ITEM 52    How often do you have to see that he does them?

BRAZIL          3     0     9    11    43    14    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        10     8    13    17    17    15    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        18    21    24     7     6     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           0     0     2     4     4    70    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          10     8    11    23    25     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         18    14    11    13    10    13    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         6    15    13    19    15     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         10    13    18    31     8     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     23    23    27     1     0     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 518.032 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     6
BRAZIL          3     0     9    11    43    14
ENGLAND        10     8    13    17    17    15
GERMANY        18    21    24     7     6     4
ITALY           0     0     2     4     4    70
JAPAN          10     8    11    23    25     3
MEXICO         18    14    11    13    10    13
CHICAGO         6    15    13    19    15     4
AUSTIN         10    13    18    31     8     2
YUGOSLAVIA     23    23    27     1     0     6
CHI-SQUARE   47.5  55.5  39.7  63.0 118.0 304.2
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories

		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Always	(01)
2	Frequently	(02)
3	Sometimes	(03)
4	Seldom	(04)
5	Never	(05)
9		(90,s)

ITEM 57-1 What does he do? (in response to punishment mentioned in 56)

```
BRAZIL        12   13   10   16   16    6    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       22    0   15   12    8    3    0   20   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       23    2   26    7   11    4    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         20   13   13   18    4    5    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         25    3    4    2    6    5    0   35   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        27   15    1   10   24    1    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       22    3   11    7   13    7    0    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        25    2   22    8   10    8    0    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    19    9   12   19    7    8    0    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 209.227 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     8
BRAZIL        12    13    10    16    16     7
ENGLAND       22     0    15    12     8    20
GERMANY       23     2    26     7    11     7
ITALY         20    13    13    18     4     7
JAPAN         25     3     4     2     6    35
MEXICO        27    15     1    10    24     1
CHICAGO       22     3    11     7    13     9
AUSTIN        25     2    22     8    10     7
YUGOSLAVIA    19     9    12    19     7     6
CHI-SQUARE  10.2  43.8  44.6  26.8  32.5  88.6
PROB.      .2500 .0000 .0000 .0011 .0002 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Takes well+apologize+discuss	(01+02+13)
2 No overt reaction	(03)
3 Sulks + withdraws	(04+05)
4 Cry	(06)
5 Hostile verbal +non-verbal behavior	(07+08+09)
6 Situational +other	(11+91)
7	(89)
9	(93+95+97+99)

ITEM 57-2 Same as Item 57-1

```
BRAZIL         5    3   12   10    7    1    5   37   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        9    0    5    1    5    1    0   59   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       19    2   11    4    2    2    4   36   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          8    0    5    3    2    1    0   61   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          6    0    2    0    2    0    0   70   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        18    7    2    4   10    3    3   32   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        6    0    2    1    2    2    0   59   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        13    1    6    5   11    1    0   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3    3    4    5    1    0    0   64   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 114.155 WITH 16 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     8     0
BRAZIL         5    37    38
ENGLAND        9    59    12
GERMANY       19    36    25
ITALY          8    61    11
JAPAN          6    70     4
MEXICO        18    32    29
CHICAGO        6    59     7
AUSTIN        13    45    24
YUGOSLAVIA     3    64    13
CHI-SQUARE  30.3  92.8  71.3
PROB.      .0004 .0000 .0000
```

ITEM 58 How does his father/mother usually discipline or punish X?

```
BRAZIL        15    9   14   15    5    5   12    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       25    4   13   14   10    7    3    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        8   12   17   16   10    3   11    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         15    3   30   18    4    1    6    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         29   13   21    5    0    0   12    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         7   15   24    6   12    2    9    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       16    8    9   11   12    9    5    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         9   11   12    8   13    9   11    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    14    2   22   15   16    2    9    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 147.565 WITH 48 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     7     0
BRAZIL        15     9    14    15     5    12    10
ENGLAND       25     4    13    14    10     3    11
GERMANY        8    12    17    16    10    11     6
ITALY         15     3    30    18     4     6     4
JAPAN         29    13    21     5     0    12     0
MEXICO         7    15    24     6    12     9     6
CHICAGO       16     8     9    11    12     5    11
AUSTIN         9    11    12     8    13    11    18
YUGOSLAVIA    14     2    22    15    16     9     2
CHI-SQUARE  36.2  22.7  24.8  17.1  26.2  10.3  35.5
PROB.      .0001 .0041 .0020 .0291 .0013 .2445 .0001
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Is not disciplined	(01)
2 Discussion + praise	(02+03)
3 Mild verbal	(04)
4 Strong verbal + threat	(05+06)
5 Deprivation of privilege	(07)
6 Deprivation of movement	(08)
7 Physical punishment + other	(09+10+91)
9	(93+95+99)

ITEM 59-1 What does X do? (in response to punishment mentioned in 58)

```
BRAZIL        19   13    3   13   11    3    0   18   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       20    4    6   15    4    2    0   29   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       32    2   20    6    5    5    0   10   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         19   11    7   19    6    2    0   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         26    1    1    0    3    4    0   45   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        25   11    2   16   12    4    0    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       25    4    8    5    9    4    0   17   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        21    3   10   10    7   12    0   19   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    25   15    8   12    4    5    0   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 163.805 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     8
BRAZIL        19    13     3    13    11    18
ENGLAND       20     4     6    15     4    29
GERMANY       32     2    20     6     5    10
ITALY         19    11     7    19     6    16
JAPAN         26     1     1     0     3    45
MEXICO        25    11     2    16    12     9
CHICAGO       25     4     8     5     9    17
AUSTIN        21     3    10    10     7    19
YUGOSLAVIA    25    15     8    12     4    11
CHI-SQUARE   9.7  34.5  38.9  30.6  14.2  69.5
PROB.      .2876 .0001 .0000 .0003 .0753 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
Same as 57-1	

```
ITEM 53   Does he try to get others to do them for him?

BRAZIL        52     9     3     6    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       48    14     3     2    13    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY       50    16     4     6     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          9     1     1     0    69    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         43    12    20     2     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        42    18     0     8    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       39    19     4     6     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        43    29     1     5     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    43    23     5     1     8    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 343.091 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     5     0
BRAZIL        52     9    10     9
ENGLAND       48    14    13     5
GERMANY       50    16     4    10
ITALY          9     1    69     1
JAPAN         43    12     3    22
MEXICO        42    18    11     8
CHICAGO       39    19     4    10
AUSTIN        43    29     4     6
YUGOSLAVIA    43    23     8     6
CHI-SQUARE  64.6  41.4 300.2  35.4
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000 .0001
```

Categories

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No	(01+02)
2	Yes - siblings	(03)
3	Yes - parents	(04)
4	Yes - non-relative	(05+06)
9		(90,s)

```
ITEM 54   How well does he do them?

BRAZIL        24    32    15     0     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       16    32    13     6    13    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          3     2     4     0    71    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         12    23    37     4     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         2    25    33     8    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       16    35    15     1     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        15    30    30     4     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     6    51    16     1     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 515.170 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     5
BRAZIL        24    32    15     9
ENGLAND       16    32    13    13
GERMANY        0     0     0    80
ITALY          3     2     4    71
JAPAN         12    23    37     4
MEXICO         2    25    33    11
CHICAGO       16    35    15     5
AUSTIN        15    30    30     3
YUGOSLAVIA     6    51    16     6
CHI-SQUARE  58.7 121.2  91.1 450.9

PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview
1	Excellent	(01)
2	Good	(02)
3	Satisfactory	(03)
4	Poor +very poor	(04+05)
9		(97+99)

```
ITEM 55   How often does X help around the house without being asked?

BRAZIL        17    12    10    17    19     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        7    17    17    16    22     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        3    11    32    21    12     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          6    28    17    14    14     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          5    13    27    20    15     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         9    16    19    21    14     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        4    11    24    19    14     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         3    17    32    20    10     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     5    16    36    20     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  81.502 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5
BRAZIL        17    12    10    17    19
ENGLAND        7    17    17    16    22
GERMANY        3    11    32    21    12
ITALY          6    28    17    14    14
JAPAN          5    13    27    20    15
MEXICO         9    16    19    21    14
CHICAGO        4    11    24    19    14
AUSTIN         3    17    32    20    10
YUGOSLAVIA     5    16    36    20     3
CHI-SQUARE  24.9  16.4  35.3   3.7  20.6
PROB.      .0020 .0369 .0001 .8843 .0085
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Always	(01)
2	Frequently	(02)
3	Sometimes	(03)
4	Seldom	(04)
5	Never	(05)
9		(90,s)

```
ITEM 56   How do you usually discipline or punish X?

BRAZIL         5    12    10    12    24     2    14     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       19     3    10    15    17    10     5     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        5     8    14    13    14    10    15     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          6     4    29    15    12     3    10     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          8    12    33     1     3     0    22     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         1    17    24     6    19     4     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        9     7     2     7    25    18     4     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         4    10    12     3    30    15     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     8     6    18     9    26     5     8     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 213.426 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6     7
BRAZIL         5    12    10    12    24     2    14
ENGLAND       19     3    10    15    17    10     5
GERMANY        5     8    14    13    14    10    15
ITALY          6     4    29    15    12     3    10
JAPAN          8    12    33     1     3     0    22
MEXICO         1    17    24     6    19     4     8
CHICAGO        9     7     2     7    25    18     4
AUSTIN         4    10    12     3    30    15     8
YUGOSLAVIA     8     6    18     9    26     5     8
CHI-SQUARE  31.3  20.0  58.6  25.9  40.3  48.5  27.0
PROB.      .0003 .0106 .0000 .0014 .0000 .0000 .0010
```

	Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Is not disciplined	(01)
2	Discussion+praise	(02+03)
3	Mild verbal	(04)
4	Strong verbal +threat	(05+06)
5	Deprivation of privilege	(07)
6	Deprivation of movement	(08)
7	Physical punishment + other	(09+10+91)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 59-2      What does X do?  (in response to punishment mentioned in 58)

BRAZIL       [illegible]   3    4    4    3    4    6   52   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND          8    0    4    1    0    1    0   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         11    1    4    2    0    3    2   57   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY            2    0    2    4    1    0    0   71   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN            0    0    1    0    1    0    0   78   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO           9    3    1    6    7    1    3   49   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO          3    0    0    4    2    1    0   62   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN           9    0    3    1    5    3    1   60   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA       4    2    3    4    0    0    0   67   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 =  67.271 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     8     0
BRAZIL           4    52    24
ENGLAND          8    66     6
GERMANY         11    57    12
ITALY            2    71     7
JAPAN            0    78     2
MEXICO           9    49    21
CHICAGO          3    62     7
AUSTIN           9    60    13
YUGOSLAVIA       4    67     9
CHI-SQUARE    21.4  52.4  42.3
PROB.        .0065 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Takes well + apologize + discuss	(01+02+10)
2	No overt reaction	(03)
3	Sulks + withdraws	(04+05)
4	Cry	(06)
5	Hostile verbal + non-verbal behavior	(07+08+09)
6	Situational + other	(11+91)
7		(89)
9		(93+95+97+99)

```
ITEM 60   How does he react when you criticize him?

BRAZIL           4    5   17    4    7    7   21   11    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         16    3   16   12    6    3   18    6    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         17    3   17   11    4    6   18    2    0    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           24    4    4    7    9    2    9   21    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           20    1    6    4    3    5   16   25    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          22    3   12    0   18   12    5    2    5    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         11    3   13    4    1    7   13   14    6    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN          13    2   26    3    4    6   12   14    1    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      11    9   29   12    0    4   11    3    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 210.359 WITH 56 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     3     4     5     6     7     8     0
BRAZIL           4    17     4     7     7    21    11     9
ENGLAND         16    16    12     6     3    18     6     3
GERMANY         17    17    11     4     6    18     2     5
ITALY           24     4     7     9     2     9    21     4
JAPAN           20     6     4     3     5    16    25     1
MEXICO          22    12     0    18    12     5     2     8
CHICAGO         11    13     4     1     7    13    14     9
AUSTIN          13    26     3     4     6    12    14     4
YUGOSLAVIA      11    29    12     0     4    11     3    10
CHI-SQUARE    24.9  41.3  25.8  43.0  13.1  17.8  60.3  15.8
PROB.        .0020 .0000 .0014 .0000 .1072 .0228 .0000 .0442
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01.	Positive acceptance, apologize, verbal rational	(01+02+11)
02	Quiet	(03)
03	Gets hurt +cries	(04+07)
04	Sulks + withdraws	(05+06)
05	Gets mad	(08)
06	Laughs it off +ignores	(09+12)
07	Defensive verbal	(10)
08	Situational + other	(13+91)
09	I don't criticize	(14)
99		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 61   How does he react when his father/mother criticizes him?   Same as Item 60

BRAZIL           5   18   14    4    4    9   12    4    6    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND         15    0   18    8    5    5   13    4    9    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         19    4   23   11    2    6    7    2    1    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           20   11   17    5    5    4    5    9    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN           26    7    3    6    1    2   12   11   11    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO           8   13   11    0   12    7    4    3   17    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         12    7   14    1    1    7   10   11    7    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN           9    6   21    5    4    3    7   13    6    8   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      10   15   25   10    3    4    4    3    1    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 178.589 WITH 56 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         1     2     3     4     7     8     9     0
BRAZIL           5    18    14     4    12     4     6    17
ENGLAND         15     0    18     8    13     4     9    13
GERMANY         19     4    23    11     7     2     1    13
ITALY           20    11    17     5     5     9     3    10
JAPAN           26     7     3     6    12    11    11     4
MEXICO           8    13    11     0     4     3    17    23
CHICAGO         12     7    14     1    10    11     7    10
AUSTIN           9     6    21     5     7    13     6    15
YUGOSLAVIA      10    15    25    10     4     3     1    12
CHI-SQUARE    31.8  32.2  26.9  20.5  14.5  24.6  34.1  19.8
PROB.        .0002 .0002 .0010 .0088 .0698 .0022 .0001 .0112
```

```
ITEM 62   How does he react when his brothers and sisters or other children criticize him?

BRAZIL           3    2   21   39    0    1   10    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND          4    5   19   46    0    0    0    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY          3    7   19   25    6    2    4   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY            4    3   28   21    5    4    3   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN            3    6   23   17    4   13    8    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO           1    5   10   56    3    2    1    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO          4    2   21   19   12    2    6    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN           6    9   40   19    3    0    3    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA       3   10   29   21    5    3    2    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 121.963 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY         3     4     8     0
BRAZIL          21    39     4    16
ENGLAND         19    46     6     9
GERMANY         19    25    14    22
ITALY           28    21    12    19
JAPAN           23    17     6    34
MEXICO          10    56     1    12
CHICAGO         21    19     6    26
AUSTIN          40    19     2    21
YUGOSLAVIA      29    21     7    23
CHI-SQUARE    31.4  86.0  24.2  31.4
PROB.        .0003 .0000 .0025 .0003
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Positive acceptance	(01)
2	Doesn't react	(02)
3	Mild reaction	(03)
4	Strong reaction	(04)
5	Withdrawal + defensive reaction	(05+06)
6	Is not criticized	(08)
7	Other	(91)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 63   Does X have a regular job or work outside the home?

BRAZIL        79    0    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       63   15    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       59    5    0   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         80    0    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         39    3    1   37   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        72    5    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       52   19    1    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        31   32    5   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    76    4    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 312.558 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     4
BRAZIL        79     0     1
ENGLAND       63    15     0
GERMANY       59     5    16
ITALY         80     0     0
JAPAN         39     3    37
MEXICO        72     5     0
CHICAGO       52    19     0
AUSTIN        31    32    14
YUGOSLAVIA    76     4     0
CHI-SQUARE 179.0 112.7 188.1
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories

1 No
2 Yes
3 Other
9

Original Codes in Interview Manual

(01)
(02+03+04+05+06+07+08)
(91)
(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 64   How does he feel about his job?

BRAZIL         0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       14    3   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          3    1   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         4    3   72   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       11    7   54   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        26    8   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     4    0   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 104.116 WITH  8 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     3
BRAZIL         0    80
ENGLAND       14    63
GERMANY        0    80
ITALY          0    80
JAPAN          3    76
MEXICO         4    72
CHICAGO       11    54
AUSTIN        26    48
YUGOSLAVIA     4    76
CHI-SQUARE  94.4 128.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

Categories

1 Positive feelings
2 Neutral+negative feelings
9

Original Codes in Interview Manual

(01)
(02+03)
(93+95+97+99)

```
ITEM 65   Why does he work?

BRAZIL         0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       16    1   63   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          4    0   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         4    3   72   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       18    1   53   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        24    7   51   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3    1   76   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 103.617 WITH  8 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     3
BRAZIL         0    80
ENGLAND       16    63
GERMANY        0    80
ITALY          0    80
JAPAN          4    76

MEXICO         4    72
CHICAGO       18    53
AUSTIN        24    51
YUGOSLAVIA     3    76
CHI-SQUARE  98.0 117.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

Categories

1 Economic reasons
2 Likes it +parental influence
9

Original Codes in Interview Manual

(01+02)
(03+04)
(90,s)

```
66          INVALID.   How did he get his job?
       0         0         0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    63    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    72    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    54    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    49    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
       0         0         0    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0  -0  -0
```

```
ITEM 67   How hard does he work at his job?

BRAZIL         0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       12     2    66    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          4     0    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         0     7    72    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       14     0    58    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        27     4    51    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     4     0    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 113.123 WITH  8 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     3
BRAZIL         0    80
ENGLAND       12    66
GERMANY        0    80
ITALY          0    80
JAPAN          4    76
MEXICO         0    72
CHICAGO       14    58
AUSTIN        27    51
YUGOSLAVIA     4    76
CHI-SQUARE 109.8 110.0
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Hard	(01)
2 Not very hard	(02)
9	(90,s)

```
ITEM 68   Does he ask for help when he runs into problems or difficulties on the job?

BRAZIL         0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        9     4    67    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        3     1    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          3     1    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         0     6    73    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       11     8    53    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        13    18    51    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3     1    76    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0

TABLE C2 = 106.254 WITH  8 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       3     0
BRAZIL        80     0
ENGLAND       67    13
GERMANY       76     4
ITALY         80     0
JAPAN         76     4
MEXICO        73     6
CHICAGO       53    19
AUSTIN        51    31
YUGOSLAVIA    76     4
CHI-SQUARE 106.3 106.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 No	(01)
2 Yes	(02+03)
9	(90's)

```
ITEM 69   What particular type of job or occupation would you like to see X take up when he is grown?

BRAZIL        30     9    10     3     3     0     0     1    11     1     4     3     1     4    -0    -0
ENGLAND        5     8    11     5     0     0     0     0    14    19     4     4     8     2    -0    -0
GERMANY        7    19    12     2     0     0     0     0    14     3     6     3    14     0    -0    -0
ITALY         22    10    24     0     0     0     0     1     4     8     5     1     5     0    -0    -0
JAPAN          7    12    19     5     2     0     0     2    10     0     8    15     0     0    -0    -0
MEXICO        32     6    17     6     1     0     0     2    13     0     1     1     0     0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       10    16    12     1     0     0     0     0    13     7     1     0    10     2    -0    -0
AUSTIN         8    11    23     1     0     0     0     3    16     7     5     6     2     0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     6    29    19    10     0     0     0     0     4     0     4     3     4     1    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 147.726 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     9     0
BRAZIL        30     9    10    11    20
ENGLAND        5     8    11    14    42
GERMANY        7    19    12    14    28
ITALY         22    10    24     4    20
JAPAN          7    12    19    10    32
MEXICO        32     6    17    13    11
CHICAGO       10    16    12    13    21
AUSTIN         8    11    23    16    24
YUGOSLAVIA     6    29    19     4    22
CHI-SQUARE  80.6  37.0  15.8  16.1  35.1
PROB.      .0000 .0001 .0446 .0407 .0001
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	(01)
02	(02)
03	(03)
04	(04)
05	(05)
06	(06)
07	(07)
08 Housewife	(08)
09 Child's preference	(09)
10 Child's welfare+anything decent	(10+12)
11 No preference	(11)
91 Other	(91)
93 Don't know	(93)
99	(95+99)

ITEM 70 What type of job or occupation would you not like to see X take up when he is grown?

```
BRAZIL        17    9   23   11    2    5    5    3    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       11    1   35    8   13    9    1    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        6   14   19   15    2    0    0   21    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         13   13   12   16    4    1    3   16    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         21   11    3   13    0   23    6    2    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         7   15   16   22    8    5    2    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       12    5   22    9    6    7    0   10    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         8    2   24   17    6    8    7    7    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     8   12   28   24    3    1    0    4    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 213.276 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1    2    3    4    6    8    0
BRAZIL        17    9   23   11    5    3   12

ENGLAND       11    1   35    8    9    2   14
GERMANY        6   14   19   15    0   21    5
ITALY         13   13   12   16    1   16    9
JAPAN         21   11    3   13   23    2    7
MEXICO         7   15   16   22    5    3   11
CHICAGO       12    5   22    9    7   10    7
AUSTIN         8    2   24   17    8    7   16
YUGOSLAVIA     8   12   28   24    1    4    3
CHI-SQUARE  20.4 26.7 45.7 18.6 64.0 54.9 16.7
PROB.      .0091 .0011 .0000 .0172 .0000 .0000 .0329
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No restrictions	(01)
2	Particular profession	(02)
3	Low status job	(03)
4	Specific occupation	(04)
5	Job not suited to child	(05)
6	Immoral or illegal	(06)
7	Other	(91)
8	Don't know	(93)
9		(95+99)

ITEM 71 What type of work do you feel X would like to do when he grows up?

```
BRAZIL        33    5   20    3    4    0    2    3    2    8    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        7   21   10    9    1    0    0    0    7   25    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        6   42   15    6    0    0    0    1    0    9    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         18   15   23    5    0    0    0    8    4    4    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         12   12   19    6    3    0    1    6   15    6    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        21    8   26    9    0    0    1    3    1    9    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       11   22   13    4    0    0    1    0    6   15    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         7   18   31    1    3    0    1    2    3    9    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3   29   17   19    2    0    0    6    2    2    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 227.142 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1    2    3    4   10    0
BRAZIL        33    5   20    3    8   11
ENGLAND        7   21   10    9   25    8
GERMANY        6   42   15    6    9    2
ITALY         18   15   23    5    4   15
JAPAN         12   12   19    6    6   25
MEXICO        21    8   26    9    9    6
CHICAGO       11   22   13    4   15    7
AUSTIN         7   18   31    1    9   16
YUGOSLAVIA     3   29   17   19    2   10
CHI-SQUARE  64.9 71.0 21.5 34.2 45.2 37.1
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0063 .0001 .0000 .0001
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01		(01)
02		(02)
03		(03)
04		(04)
05		(05)
06		(06)
07	Housewife	(08)
08	No preference	(09)
91	Other	(91)
93	Don't know	(93)
99		(95+99)

ITEM 72 What type of work do you feel X probably will do when he grows up?

```
BRAZIL        20    5    9    2    0    0    5   32    6    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        4    6    9    8    0    0    0   46    7    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        4   13    7    3    0    0    1   48    2    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          8   13   22    5    0    0    0   27    1    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          4   12   24    5    1    0    4   19    9    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        20    2   18    4    0    0    2   29    0    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        5   16    8    2    0    0    1   32    7    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         6   10   20    5    4    0    7   20    9    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     2   16   20   17    1    1    0   19    3    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 179.687 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1    2    3    4    8    0
BRAZIL        20    5    9    2   32   12
ENGLAND        4    6    9    8   46    7
GERMANY        4   13    7    3   48    5
ITALY          8   13   22    5   27    3
JAPAN          4   12   24    5   19   16

MEXICO        20    2   18    4   29    6
CHICAGO        5   16    8    2   32    9
AUSTIN         6   10   20    5   20   21
YUGOSLAVIA     2   16   20   17   19    6
CHI-SQUARE  52.4 23.8 29.0 31.7 51.3 31.2
PROB.      .0000 .0029 .0005 .0002 .0000 .0003
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01		(01)
02		(02)
03		(03)
04		(04)
05		(05)
06		(06)
07	Housewife	(08)
08	No preference+don't know	(09+93)
91	Other	(91)
99		(95+99)

ITEM 73A Children are different in how they get along with other children. How does X get along with other children?
A. Parent's evaluation.

BRAZIL	29	37	8	6	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	41	32	7	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	13	55	9	3	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	36	26	11	7	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	8	70	2	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	18	49	11	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	41	28	2	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	31	36	10	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	33	42	4	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 93.618 WITH 16 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	1	2	3
BRAZIL	29	37	8
ENGLAND	41	32	7
GERMANY	13	55	9
ITALY	36	26	11
JAPAN	8	70	2
MEXICO	18	49	11
CHICAGO	41	28	2
AUSTIN	31	36	10
YUGOSLAVIA	33	42	4
CHI-SQUARE	69.2	77.5	15.3
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.0533

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Very well	(01)
2	Average	(02)
3	Not very well	(03)
9		(90.s)

ITEM 73B How does X get along with other children? B. Child's behavior

BRAZIL	7	2	28	1	17	3	6	16	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	5	0	19	0	7	6	1	42	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	22	2	8	3	10	2	1	32	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	13	14	30	1	10	3	4	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	1	0	49	0	15	12	3	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	21	5	22	2	22	2	0	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	2	9	8	1	1	4	12	35	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	15	7	16	2	4	4	3	31	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	8	0	27	3	9	2	2	29	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 251.069 WITH 32 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	1	3	5	8	0
BRAZIL	7	28	17	16	12
ENGLAND	5	19	7	42	7
GERMANY	22	8	10	32	8
ITALY	13	30	10	5	22
JAPAN	1	49	15	0	15
MEXICO	21	22	22	5	9
CHICAGO	2	8	1	35	26
AUSTIN	15	16	4	31	16
YUGOSLAVIA	8	27	9	29	7
CHI-SQUARE	51.5	75.4	36.6	123.8	37.7
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.0001	.0000	.0000

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Bossy dominating+has a temper	(01+03)
2	Shy, follower	(02)
3	Gregarious+changes friends often	(04+06)
4	Independent	(05)
5	Very few friends + no friends	(07+09)
6	Long term friends	(08)
7	Other	(91)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 74 What do you do to help X get along with other children?

BRAZIL	26	5	15	13	16	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	29	42	4	1	4	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	0	0	0	0	0	80	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	37	6	18	11	4	4	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	29	30	7	6	8	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	12	14	17	12	24	0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	19	15	10	10	16	2	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	18	18	18	6	21	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	24	5	36	11	3	1	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 809.988 WITH 40 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	5	6
BRAZIL	26	5	15	13	16	5
ENGLAND	29	42	4	1	4	0
GERMANY	0	0	0	0	0	80
ITALY	37	6	18	11	4	4
JAPAN	29	30	7	6	8	0
MEXICO	12	14	17	12	24	0
CHICAGO	19	15	10	10	16	2
AUSTIN	18	18	18	6	21	1
YUGOSLAVIA	24	5	36	11	3	1
CHI-SQUARE	59.5	119.7	75.8	26.9	67.0	603.6
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0010	.0000	.0000

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Nothing	(01)
2	Encourage social activity	(02)
3	Training, positive approach	(03)
4	Training, negative approach	(04)
5	Training unspecified + anything possible	(05+06+91)
6	Punishment	(07+95+99)

ITEM 75 In what ways do X's friends influence his behavior?

BRAZIL	38	9	13	6	10	4	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ENGLAND	34	6	10	7	21	2	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
GERMANY	43	5	13	7	5	7	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
ITALY	45	6	15	5	4	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
JAPAN	20	12	15	1	23	9	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
MEXICO	45	9	13	3	4	5	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
CHICAGO	21	5	17	1	22	6	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
AUSTIN	21	4	20	5	22	10	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
YUGOSLAVIA	10	47	8	9	0	6	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0

TABLE C2 = 252.042 WITH 32 DF. P = .0000

CATEGORY	1	2	3	5	6
BRAZIL	38	9	13	10	4
ENGLAND	34	6	10	21	2
GERMANY	43	5	13	5	7
ITALY	45	6	15	4	5
JAPAN	20	12	15	23	9
MEXICO	45	9	13	4	5
CHICAGO	21	5	17	22	6
AUSTIN	21	4	20	22	10
YUGOSLAVIA	10	47	8	0	6
CHI-SQUARE	70.3	148.3	9.5	71.8	8.3
PROB.	.0000	.0000	.3007	.0000	.4014

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No influence	(01+06)
2	General influence, good	(02)
3	Influence neither good nor bad	(03+91)
4	General influence,bad	(04)
5	Specific influences	(05)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 76 What do you think about this? (Friends influences described in 75)

```
BRAZIL        12   16    5    4    4   39   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        9    1   19   13   25   13   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        0    0    0    0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          6    6    7   13   33   15   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         37    2   13    7    5   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        15   11    6    8   14   25   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       13   11    7   10   14   17   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        15   17    8   10   16   16   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    49    8    2    8    6    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLF C2 = 427.834 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6
BRAZIL        12    16     5     4     4    39
ENGLAND        9     1    19    13    25    13
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     0    80
ITALY          6     6     7    13    33    15
JAPAN         37     2    13     7     5    16
MEXICO        15    11     6     8    14    25
CHICAGO       13    11     7    10    14    17
AUSTIN        15    17     8    10    16    16
YUGOSLAVIA    49     8     2     8     6     7
CHI-SQUARE 141.6  43.8  37.8  19.4  83.9 229.4
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000 .0130 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Positive	(01)
2	Ambivalent	(02)
3	Neutral + other	(03+91)
4	Negative	(04)
5	Approves lack of influence	(05)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 77 When X gets worried what does he do about it?

```
BRAZIL        14   33    0    5    6   17    4    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       18   15    3   12   21    0    4    7   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       64    6    1    4    1    1    3    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         13   28    4    4   17    6    7    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         46    5    7    2    1    3   13    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        18   19   12    6    4   11    3    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       25   11    4    9   14    0    3    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        27   14    3   12   11    2    4    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    24   20    5    2   12   11    4    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 258.975 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     4     5     6     0
BRAZIL        14    33     5     6    17     5
ENGLAND       18    15    12    21     0    14
GERMANY       64     6     4     1     1     4
ITALY         13    28     4    17     6    12
JAPAN         46     5     2     1     3    23
MEXICO        18    19     6     4    11    21
CHICAGO       25    11     9    14     0    13
AUSTIN        27    14    12    11     2    16
YUGOSLAVIA    24    20     2    12    11    11
CHI-SQUARE 124.0  51.8  21.4  48.4  54.7  29.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0064 .0000 .0000 .0005
```

Categories -		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Talks with someone	(01+91)
2	Depressed + loses control + hostile affect	(02+05+10)
3	Goal directed action	(03)
4	Tries to remain calm+prevents display of feeling + mention of outcome	(04+11+12)
5	Withdraws+specific behavioral response	(06+07+08)
6	Lack of action or affect	(09)
7	Doesn't worry	(13)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 78 What kinds of things does he worry about?

```
BRAZIL        12   35    5    8   10    6    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        5   35   13    4   14    3    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        5   53   10    5    2    3    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          6   55    1    4    5    5    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          8   26   11    5    2   24    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         4   51    5   15    3    1    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       11   32   11    2    4    3    9   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         9   27   28    1    9    3    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     5   67    1    2    2    1    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 164.542 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     5     0
BRAZIL        12    35     5    10    18
ENGLAND        5    35    13    14    13
GERMANY        5    53    10     2    10
ITALY          6    55     1     5    13
JAPAN          8    26    11     2    33
MEXICO         4    51     5     3    16
CHICAGO       11    32    11     4    14
AUSTIN         9    27    28     9     9
YUGOSLAVIĀ     5    67     1     2     5
CHI-SQUARE  11.3  82.6  63.2  27.7  42.2
PROB.      .1870 .0000 .0000 .0008 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Death+war+institutions+health+other	(01+02+03+08+91)
2	Academic problems	(04)
3	Youth problems	(05)
4	Family problems	(06)
5	Self-concern	(07)
6		(97)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 79   How do you tell when X is worried?

BRAZIL          3    19    24    20     7     5     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         7     6    19    23    22     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           3    14    28    18     9     7     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          10     8    42    10     0    10     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          1    21    28    21     6     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        11    26     4    17    11     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         10    11    12    34     7     2     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      6     9    12    40    10     1     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 751.715 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     7
BRAZIL          3    19    24    20     7     2
ENGLAND         7     6    19    23    22     0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0    80
ITALY           3    14    28    18     9     1
JAPAN          10     8    42    10     0     0
MEXICO          1    21    28    21     6     1
CHICAGO        11    26     4    17    11     0
AUSTIN         10    11    12    34     7     6
YUGOSLAVIA      6     9    12    40    10     2
CHI-SQUARE   27.1  55.4  95.1  71.5  48.3 611.2
PROB.       .0009 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Can't tell + other + don't know	(01+91+93)
2	Discussion	(02)
3	Talks more + appearance	(03+05)
4	Talks less	(04)
5	Losses his temper + nervous	(06+07)
6		(97)
9		(95+99)

```
ITEM 80-1 When he has worries does he turn to others for help?

BRAZIL         26    35     8     6     0     3     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        19    23    29     4     2     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         8    53    15     2     1     1     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          33    24     7     6     5     4     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0

JAPAN          33    31     0     2     4     9     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         25    28    10    10     5     1     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        19    28    18     1     2     3     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         13    25    19     5    14     3     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     28    19    19     9     4     1     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 117.073 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     0
BRAZIL         26    35     8    11
ENGLAND        19    23    29     9
GERMANY         8    53    15     4
ITALY          33    24     7    16
JAPAN          33    31     0    16
MEXICO         25    28    10    16
CHICAGO        19    28    18     7
AUSTIN         13    25    19    25
YUGOSLAVIA     28    19    19    14
CHI-SQUARE   36.3  42.6  51.9  26.0
PROB.       .0001 .0000 .0000 .0014
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No	(01)
2	Yes - Mother	(03)
3	Yes - father+ yes-parents	(04+05)
4	Yes-other relations + yes-siblings	(06+07)
5	Yes-others	(08+09+10+02+91)
6		(97)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 81   What do you usually advise X to do when he is worried?

BRAZIL         32    12     4    16     1     3    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        42     9     6     9     7     3     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        37    19     4     3     3     1    13    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          45    18     2     0     5     5     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          44    14     1     0     3    11     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         39    21     3    10     4     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        27    17     3     8     6     3     8    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         21    16     5    23     5     3     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     55     3     1     3     5     1    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 121.260 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     4     7     0
BRAZIL         32    12    16    12     8
ENGLAND        42     9     9     4    16
GERMANY        37    19     3    13     8
ITALY          45    18     0     5    12
JAPAN          44    14     0     7    15
MEXICO         39    21    10     1     8
CHICAGO        27    17     8     8    12
AUSTIN         21    16    23     9    13
YUGOSLAVIA     55     3     3    12     7
CHI-SQUARE   40.1  22.4  63.6  18.5   9.6
PROB.       .0000 .0046 .0000 .0179 .2923
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Support+religious solace+tension reduction	(01)+04+05)
2	Direct action	(02)
3	Accept situation	(03)
4	Ambiguous response	(06)
5	No advice given	(07)
6		(97)
9		(91+93+95+99)

```
ITEM 82   What kinds of things make X angry?

BRAZIL        37     9    22     1     0     4     2     2     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       49     2    12     0    10     3     2     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY       27    22     7     6     0     3     6     9     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY         38    11    13     6     0     1     4     3     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         47     8    12     2     0     4     3     4     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        51     8    13     1     0     0     4     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       36    10     3     6     7     2     1     6     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        48     8    17     1     2     2     2     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    27     7    23     7     3     1     2     6     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  85.076 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     0
BRAZIL        37     9    22    12
ENGLAND       49     2    12    17
GERMANY       27    22     7    24
ITALY         38    11    13    18
JAPAN         47     8    12    13
MEXICO        51     8    13     7
CHICAGO       36    10     3    23
AUSTIN        48     8    17     9
YUGOSLAVIA    27     7    23    23
CHI-SQUARE  33.1  27.5  27.5  27.3
PROB.      .0002 .0009 .0008 .0009
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Minor grievances	(01+14)
2	Major grievances	(02+07)
3	Parents, authority	(03+06)
4	Own behavior	(04+09)
5	Mistreatment of others	(08)
6	Others behavior	(10+12)
7	Never or seldom gets angry	(13)
8	Other causes	(05+11+91)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 84   What does X usually do when he gets angry?

BRAZIL         8    16     1    22    10    10     1     5     0     2     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        8     7     3    30     6    19     2     1     2     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        8     9     2    24     6    15     1     6     0     6     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          9     9     4    19     9    10     2     9     5     3     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          8    21     0    24     7     9     1     5     1     0     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        17     7     4    14    10    13     1    10     0     1     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       11    11     4    27     6     5     0     2     3     1     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         9    11     3    31     8     5     2     3     2     1     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    20    11     5    18    13     4     2     5     1     1     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 =  75.013 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0009

CATEGORY       1     2     4     5     6     0
BRAZIL         8    16    22    10    10    14
ENGLAND        8     7    30     6    19    10
GERMANY        8     9    24     6    15    18
ITALY          9     9    19     9    10    24
JAPAN          8    21    24     7     9    11
MEXICO        17     7    14    10    13    18
CHICAGO       11    11    27     6     5    12
AUSTIN         9    11    31     8     5    18
YUGOSLAVIA    20    11    18    13     4    14
CHI-SQUARE  17.5  16.7  16.0   5.8  22.4  11.9
PROB.      .0256 .0332 .0414 .6730 .0046 .1555
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Withdraws	(01)
02	Hostile affect	(02)
03	Controls anger + copes actively	(03+09)
04	Verbal hostility	(04)
05	Depressed affect	(05)
06	Physical aggression	(06)
07	Physiological reaction	(07)
08	No action or affect	(08)
09	Seeks help	(10)
10		(97)
99		(91+93+95+99)

```
ITEM 85   What does X usually do when he gets angry at you?

BRAZIL         3     6     8    10     9    12    10    15     4     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       17     4     3    11     0    21    11    11     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY       16     1     2     6     4    24     4    10    10     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          4    17     7     8    15    10     1     4    14     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          4     0     0    16     9    33     3    13     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        15     8     5     2    20     9     6     2    10     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       19     4     4     5     1    25     4     0     8     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        20     4     8    10     3    25     4     1     2     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    15     9    17     0     7    25     1     3     2     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 282.116 WITH 64 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6     8     9     0

BRAZIL         3     6     8    10     9    12    15     4    13
ENGLAND       17     4     3    11     0    21    11     2    11
GERMANY       16     1     2     6     4    24    10    10     7
ITALY          4    17     7     8    15    10     4    14     1
JAPAN          4     0     0    16     9    33    13     2     3
MEXICO        15     8     5     2    20     9     2    10     8
CHICAGO       19     4     4     5     1    25     0     8     6
AUSTIN        20     4     8    10     3    25     1     2     9
YUGOSLAVIA    15     9    17     0     7    25     3     2     2
CHI-SQUARE  37.3  37.4  34.5  27.2  50.4  36.7  41.9  30.9  21.6
PROB.      .0001 .0001 .0001 .0009 .0000 .0001 .0000 .0003 .0061
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Withdraws	(01)
02	Control affect+resolve misunderstanding + acceptance of blame	(02+07+09)
03	Negative emotional reaction-depressive	(03)
04	Negative emotional reaction-hostile	(04)
05	No action or affect	(05)
06	Verbal aggression	(06)
07	Behavioral rebellion	(08)
08	Withdrawal of+need of affection	(10+11+91)
09		(97)
99		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 89-2   What do you feel are the important things a child should learn as he is growing up?

BRAZIL          1     2    17    22     5    15    18    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         7     3    31    13     0    16    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         6     3    19    18     3    15    18    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           1     4    28    20     0     0    27    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           1     2     9    13     0    10    45    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          9     4    10    11    15    21     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         5     3    26    14     3     3    18    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         15     2    21    21     3     8    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      1    12    17    14     4     1    31    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 168.687 WITH 32 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        3     4     6     7     0
BRAZIL         17    22    15    18     8
ENGLAND        31    13    16    10    10
GERMANY        19    18    15    18    10
ITALY          28    20     0    27     5
JAPAN           9    13    10    45     3
MEXICO         10    11    21     9    28
CHICAGO        26    14     3    18    11
AUSTIN         21    21     8    11    21
YUGOSLAVIA     17    14     1    31    17
CHI-SQUARE   32.9   9.3  50.0  71.0  48.1
PROB.       .0002 .3189 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories

Same as Item 89-1

```
ITEM 90-1   Have you taken any courses or training since you left school?

BRAZIL         31    10    10     4    23     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        45    25     3     3     2     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0     0    -0
ITALY          59     9     3     1     4     3     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          10    19     6    22    22     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         47     1    11     9     9     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        43     9     9     7     2     2     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         39    24     3     6     3     6     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     47    24     1     0     2     5     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 872.694 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     4     5     7     0
BRAZIL         31    10     4    23     2    10
ENGLAND        45    25     3     2     0     5
GERMANY         0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY          59     9     1     4     1     6
JAPAN          10    19    22    22     1     6
MEXICO         47     1     9     9     1    12
CHICAGO        43     9     7     2     0    11
AUSTIN         39    24     6     3     1     9
YUGOSLAVIA     47    24     0     2     1     6
CHI-SQUARE  151.0  66.8  69.9  92.3 648.7  17.8
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0224
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 No	(01)
2 Yes-professional+intellectual	(02+03)
3 Yes-intellectual short term	(04)
4 Yes-recreational	(05)
5 Yes-domestic	(06)
6 Yes-service	(07)
9	(91+95+99)

```
ITEM 91   Why did you take them?

BRAZIL          7    15     5    19    34    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        19     5     3     7    46    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           6     6     2     9    57    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          10    45     4    10    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          0    11     5    16    47    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO         8     7     5     9    43    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         20     6     7     7    42    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     21     5     5     1    48    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 269.080 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     4     5
BRAZIL          7    15    19    34
ENGLAND        19     5     7    46
GERMANY         0     0     0    80
ITALY           6     6     9    57
JAPAN          10    45    10    11
MEXICO          0    11    16    47
CHICAGO         8     7     9    43
AUSTIN         20     6     7    42
YUGOSLAVIA     21     5     1    48
CHI-SQUARE   58.3 147.8  39.3 136.9
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Economic	(01)
2 Personal+social+other	(02+03+91)
3 Self-improvement	(04)
4 Personal sitisfaction	(05)
9	(97+99)

```
ITEM 92   When did you take it (them)?

BRAZIL         27     2     3    11    37    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        23     3     4     3    47    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          19     2     2     0    57    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          48     4     2    15    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          6     8    12     6    47    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        12     2     7     8    43    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN          9     9    13     7    44    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     11    12     3     6    48    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 225.836 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     4     5     0
BRAZIL         27    11    37     5
ENGLAND        23     3    47     7
GERMANY         0     0    80     0
ITALY          19     0    57     4
JAPAN          48    15    11     6
MEXICO          6     6    47    20
CHICAGO        12     8    43     9
AUSTIN          9     7    44    22
YUGOSLAVIA     11     6    48    15
CHI-SQUARE  119.3  33.6 133.5  51.9
PROB.       .0000 .0001 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Shortly after school	(01)
2 5-10 years	(02)
3 At present+within last 4 years	(03+04)
4 Over a long period	(05)
9	(91+97+99)

```
ITEM 86   What does X usually do when he gets angry at his father/mother?

BRAZIL         7    6    5    8    8    8    1    4    4   17    7    5   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       15    1    3    7    3   11    2    8    1   23    4    2   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       13    5    5    4    6   10    7    3    2   11    9    5   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          2    7    4    4   19    5    2    0   11    1   23    2   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          6    3    0   17    8   13    0    2    0   25    4    2   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        14    2    6    1   20    3    1    1    5    3   17    6   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       16    1    4    6    4   19    4    1    0    1   12    4   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        18    4    7    5    9   18    1    3    1    4    3    9   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    12   11   10    3   11   15    1    1   12    0    2    2   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 253.398 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     4     5     6    10    11     0
BRAZIL         7     8     8     8    17     7    25
ENGLAND       15     7     3    11    23     4    17
GERMANY       13     4     6    10    11     9    27
ITALY          2     4    19     5     1    23    26
JAPAN          6    17     8    13    25     4     7
MEXICO        14     1    20     3     3    17    21
CHICAGO       16     6     4    19     1    12    14
AUSTIN        18     5     9    18     4     3    25
YUGOSLAVIA    12     3    11    15     0     2    37
CHI-SQUARE  23.8  29.7  33.3  26.8  92.9  52.2  35.3
PROB.      .0028 .0004 .0002 .0010 .0000 .0000 .0001
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Withdraws	(01)
02	Control of affect	(02)
03	Negative emotional reaction-depressive	(03)
04	Negative emotional reaction-hostile	(04)
05	No action or affect	(05)
06	Verbal aggression	(06)
07	Resolves misunderstanding	(07)
08	Behavioral rebellion	(08)
09	Acceptance of blame+withdrawal of+ need of affection	(09+10+11)
91		(91)
97		(97)
99		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 87   What does X usually do when a friend is angry at him?

BRAZIL         6   15   13    6    6   12    5   16    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        4    7   18   17    7    3    0   24    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        6    8   18   16    2    7    0   11   12   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          9   14    8    7    9   10    1   19    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          3    5   13    3    2   12   12   29    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        10   11    8   24    4    6    3   11    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       10    9   15    8   12    4    5    9    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        17    8   11   11    7    0    9   17    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    20   20   12    6    8    2    1   11    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 173.896 WITH 56 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6     8     0
BRAZIL         6    15    13     6     6    12    16     6
ENGLAND        4     7    18    17     7     3    24     0
GERMANY        6     8    18    16     2     7    11    12
ITALY          9    14     8     7     9    10    19     4
JAPAN          3     5    13     3     2    12    29    13
MEXICO        10    11     8    24     4     6    11     5
CHICAGO       10     9    15     8    12     4     9     5
AUSTIN        17     8    11    11     7     0    17    11
YUGOSLAVIA    20    20    12     6     8     2    11     1
CHI-SQUARE  31.2  19.0  10.7  39.0  16.6  26.3  26.4  29.3
PROB.      .0003 .0151 .2161 .0000 .0347 .0012 .0012 .0005
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Reinstate friendship+simple acceptance	(01+06)
2	No reaction	(02)
3	Hostile emotion or action	(03+07)
4	Withdrawal+substitute friends	(04+08)
5	Depressed affect	(05)
6	Denial	(10)
7		(91)
8		(93)
9		(95+99)

```
ITEM 88   What does X usually do when someone hurts his fellings?

BRAZIL        15   36   11    6    4    2    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       18   37    9   13    0    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       17   13   38    4    2    0    6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          5   14   39    3    3   11    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          7    5   34   15    2    6   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        11   36   24    4    1    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       11   25   13   14    4    1    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        11   36   14   12    3    1    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    23   24   18    9    1    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 163.941 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     0
BRAZIL        15    36    11     6    12
ENGLAND       18    37     9    13     3
GERMANY       17    13    38     4     8
ITALY          5    14    39     3    19
JAPAN          7     5    34    15    19
MEXICO        11    36    24     4     4
CHICAGO       11    25    13    14     9
AUSTIN        11    36    14    12     9
YUGOSLAVIA    23    24    18     9     6
CHI-SQUARE  23.0  67.6  69.4  24.1  31.1
PROB.      .0038 .0000 .0000 .0025 .0003
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Ignores or withdraws	(01)
2	Negative depressed affect	(02)
3	Hostile affect+verbal hostility+physical aggression	(03+05+07)
4	Stoical acceptance+cognitive coping+coping+ turn to others	(04+06+09+10)
5	Physiological reaction	(08+91)
6	Doesn't happen	(11)
9		(93+95+99)

```
ITEM 89-1   Different people feel different things are important.  What do you feel are the important things a child should learn as a person

BRAZIL         6    9   18   27   16    0    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        4    9   37   29    0    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        3   10   28   38    1    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          4   27   16   18   10    0    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          5    1   49   20    4    0    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         2    3   16   41   17    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO       10    3   35   23    1    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        12    3   40   25    2    0    0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3   14   22   28   10    0    3   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 179.666 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2     3     4     5     0
BRAZIL         9    18    27    16    10
ENGLAND        9    37    29     0     5
GERMANY       10    28    38     1     3
ITALY         27    16    18    10     9
JAPAN          1    49    20     4     6
MEXICO         3    16    41    17     2
CHICAGO        3    35    23     1    10
AUSTIN         3    40    25     2    12

YUGOSLAVIA    14    22    28    10     6
CHI-SQUARE  65.4  62.3  25.6  56.4  15.1
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0016 .0000 .0568
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Religious values+understanding self	(01+09)
2	Good manners, culture	(02)
3	Social values+citizenship+respect for parents+others	(03+07+11+91)
4	Personal values+materialistic values+ specific skills+sexual education	(04+05+06+08)
5	Value of education	(10)
6		(89)
9		(93+95+99)

ITEM 93 Did you complete them?

```
BRAZIL        20    4   23   33   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        4    3   27   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        0    0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          8    1   14   57   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         22   24   23   11   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        16    5   11   47   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        5    1   20   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         4    4   33   41   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     0    0   32   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 169.953 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1    3    4
BRAZIL        20   23   33
ENGLAND        4   27   46
GERMANY        0    0   80
ITALY          8   14   57
JAPAN         22   23   11
MEXICO        16   11   47
CHICAGO        5   20   46
AUSTIN         4   33   41
YUGOSLAVIA     0   32   48
CHI-SQUARE  71.9 57.6 139.9
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 No	(01)
2 Some of them	(02)
3 Yes	(03)
9	(97+99)

ITEM 94 Do you feel you gained from it?

```
BRAZIL         2   45   33   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        4   30   46   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY          9   13   58   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         12   58   10   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         3   29   47   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        5   23   44   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         0   41   41   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     1   31   48   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 140.136 WITH  8 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2    3
BRAZIL        45   33
ENGLAND       30   46
GERMANY        0   80
ITALY         13   58
JAPAN         58   10
MEXICO        29   47
CHICAGO       23   44
AUSTIN        41   41
YUGOSLAVIA    31   48
CHI-SQUARE 123.2 143.6
PROB.      .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 No	(01)
2 Yes	(02)
9	(97+99)

ITEM 95 You said you were a ________________, could you tell me how you came to be in this kind of work?

```
BRAZIL         6    0    2    1    5    1   63    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        3    7    3    3    9    4   37   14   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY        6    1    1    9    1    0   60    2   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0

ITALY          1    4    2    3    1    2   66    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          2    2    1    9    4    2   55    5   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO         1    1    2    5    0    3   66    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        2    0    0    1    1    5   59    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         4    4    7    3    3   15   42    4   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    12    2   12    1    5   20   27    1   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 137.514 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       6    7    0
BRAZIL         1   63   16
ENGLAND        4   37   39
GERMANY        0   60   20
ITALY          2   66   12
JAPAN          2   55   23
MEXICO         3   66   10
CHICAGO        5   59    8
AUSTIN        15   42   25
YUGOSLAVIA    20   27   33
CHI-SQUARE  69.9 97.4 54.4
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Wanted this work	(01)
2 Convenience	(02)
3 External factors	(03)
4 Family trade+financial returns	(04+08)
5 Through friends	(05)
6 No particular reason	(06)
7 Not working or housewife	(07)
9	(91+93+95+99)

ITEM 96 What is your job like?

```
BRAZIL        13    2   65   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND       14    9   57   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY       12    2   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY         12    0   68   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN         23    0   57   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO        12    1   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO        6    5   61   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN        23   12   47   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA    33   20   27   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 120.891 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1    2    3
BRAZIL        13    2   65
ENGLAND       14    9   57
GERMANY       12    2   66
ITALY         12    0   68
JAPAN         23    0   57
MEXICO        12    1   66
CHICAGO        6    5   61
AUSTIN        23   12   47
YUGOSLAVIA    33   20   27
CHI-SQUARE  39.2 69.0 92.5
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Descriptive	(01)
2 Evaluative	(02)
9	(91+97+99)

```
ITEM 97   How do you feel about it?

BRAZIL         14    1    1   64   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        32   11    0   37   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         0    0    0   80   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           7    3    2   68   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          13    8    2   57   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          9    3    1   66   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         9    2    1   60   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN         33    2    3   44   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     45    3    5   27   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 118.270 WITH  8 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     4
BRAZIL         14    64
ENGLAND        32    37
GERMANY         0    80
ITALY           7    68
JAPAN          13    57
MEXICO          9    66
CHICAGO         9    60
AUSTIN         33    44
YUGOSLAVIA     45    27
CHI-SQUARE  124.8 143.1
PROB.       .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Positive affect	(01)
2	Neutral or ambivalent affect	(02)
3	Negative affect	(03)
9		(93-97-99)

```
ITEM 98   What do you like about it?

BRAZIL          0    2    1    1    0    1    0    0    2    0    5    0    2    0    0   67
ENGLAND         3    6    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0   10    0   23    0    0   37
GERMANY         0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0   80
ITALY           1    0    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    2    0    5    0    0   68
JAPAN           0    2    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    5    0    4    1    0   65
MEXICO          0    0    0    0    0    1    0    0    2    0    6    0    3    0    0   67
CHICAGO         1    2    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    0    4    0    2    0    0   60
AUSTIN          1    3    0    0    0    0    0    1    3    1   10    0   11    1    0   45
YUGOSLAVIA      0    8    0    0    0    0    0    1    0    1   16    0   14    7    0   29
TABLE C2 = 162.595 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY       11    13    16     0
BRAZIL          5     2    67     7
ENGLAND        10    23    37     9
GERMANY         0     0    80     0
ITALY           2     5    68     3
JAPAN           5     4    65     4
MEXICO          6     3    67     3
CHICAGO         4     2    60     4
AUSTIN         10    11    45    10
YUGOSLAVIA     16    14    29    17
CHI-SQUARE   32.6  68.8 142.5  36.6
PROB.       .0002 .0000 .0000 .0001
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Interesting things	(01)
02	Different things	(02)
03	Nice place to work	(03)
04	Security	(04)
05	Helping other people	(05)
06	Authority	(06)
07	Creative	(07)
08	Money	(08)
09	Chance to get ahead	(09)
10	Independence	(10)
11	Pleasant associates	(11)
12	Doing a job well	(12)
13	Special characteristics of job	(13)
14	Everything	(14)
15	Nothing	(15)
99		(90,s)

```
ITEM 99   What do you dislike about it?
BRAZIL          0    2    1    1    0    1    0    0    2    0    5    0    2    0   66   -0
ENGLAND         3    6    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0   10    0   23    0   38   -0
GERMANY         0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0   80   -0
ITALY           1    0    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    2    0    5    0   70   -0
JAPAN           0    2    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    5    0    4    1   67   -0
MEXICO          0    0    0    0    0    1    0    0    2    0    6    0    3    0   67   -0
CHICAGO         1    2    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    0    4    0    2    0   62   -0
AUSTIN          1    3    0    0    0    0    0    1    3    1   10    0   11    1   51   -0
YUGOSLAVIA      0    8    0    0    0    0    0    1    0    1   16    0   14    7   33   -0
TABLE C2 = 155.771 WITH 24 DF.   P = .0000
CATEGORY       11    13    15     0
BRAZIL          5     2    66     7
ENGLAND        10    23    38     9
GERMANY         0     0    80     0
ITALY           2     5    70     3
JAPAN           5     4    67     4
MEXICO          6     3    67     3
CHICAGO         4     2    62     4
AUSTIN         10    11    51    10
YUGOSLAVIA     16    14    33    17
CHI-SQUARE   30.8  67.6 135.4  34.7
PROB.       .0003 .0000 .0000 .0001
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Boring	(01)
02	Poor conditions	(02)
03	Insecurity	(03)
04	No responsibility	(04)
05	No self-expression	(05)
06	Low pay	(06)
07	No opportunity for advancement	(07)
08	Can't work on own	(08)
09	Doesn't like associates	(09)
10	No feeling of accomplishment	(10)
11	Special characteristics of job	(11)
12	Everything	(12)
13	Nothing	(13)
14	Too much work	(14)
99		(90,s)

```
ITEM 100  Would you choose the same kind of work if you had it to
          do over?
BRAZIL          8    8    0   64   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ENGLAND        14   25    4   37   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
GERMANY         7   12    0   61   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
ITALY           7    4    1   68   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
JAPAN          14    8    0   58   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
MEXICO          4    9    0   66   -0   -0   -0   -6   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
CHICAGO         6    6    0   60   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
AUSTIN          5   29    6   42   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
YUGOSLAVIA     30   22    1   27   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0   -0
TABLE C2 = 130.468 WITH 16 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     4
BRAZIL          8     8    64
ENGLAND        14    25    37
GERMANY         7    12    61
ITALY           7     4    68
JAPAN          14     8    58
MEXICO          4     9    66
CHICAGO         6     6    60
AUSTIN          5    29    42
YUGOSLAVIA     30    22    27
CHI-SQUARE   56.5  56.2 106.4
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	No	(01)
2	Yes	(02)
3	Conditional or uncertain	(03)
8		(90,s)

ITEM 101 When you are on the job and problems come up about the work, what do you do?

```
BRAZIL         9     1     2     1     0    67    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       14     7    15     0     6    38    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        6     2     2     1     3    66    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          7     1     3     1     0    68    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          4     4    10     0     3    59    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         6     0     1     3     2    67    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        5     2     2     0     2    61    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        16     5    11     1     2    47    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    17    10     8     7     8    30    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 135.191 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     3     6     0
BRAZIL         9     2    67     2
ENGLAND       14    15    38    13
GERMANY        6     2    66     6

ITALY          7     3    68     2
JAPAN          4    10    59     7
MEXICO         6     1    67     5
CHICAGO        5     2    61     4
AUSTIN        16    11    47     8
YUGOSLAVIA    17     8    30    25
CHI-SQUARE  22.8  36.1 104.8  56.6
PROB.      .0040 .0001 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Solve by self	(01)
2	Attempt own solution and then seek help	(02+03)
3	Seeks help	(04+05+06)
4	Withdraw + affective responses	(07+08)
5	Denies problem	(09)
9		(91+93+95+97+99)

ITEM 102 What is the best way to get along with your fellow workers (colleagues)?

```
BRAZIL         3     0     1     5     4    67    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        5     1     1    20    15    38    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        2     0     0    13     1    64    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          6     2     1     2     0    69    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          4     1     0     4    10    61    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         4     0     1     3     4    67    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        0     0     0    11     0    61    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         4     9     3    12     8    46    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     1     5     3    25    14    32    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 145.455 WITH 24 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       4     5     6     0
BRAZIL         5     4    67     4
ENGLAND       20    15    38     7
GERMANY       13     1    64     2
ITALY          2     0    69     9
JAPAN          4    10    61     5
MEXICO         3     4    67     5
CHICAGO       11     0    61     0
AUSTIN        12     8    46    16
YUGOSLAVIA    25    14    32     9
CHI-SQUARE  55.2  45.7 100.7  28.3
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000 .0007
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Works alone	(01)
2	Do your work	(02)
3	Ignore them	(03)
4	Good social relationships	(04)
5	Tolerance	(05)
9		(90,s)

ITEM 103 What is the best way to get along with your boss or supervisor?

```
BRAZIL         5     8     0     2     1     0    64    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        7    18     0     7     2     1    45    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        3     7     0     0     0     0    70    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          4     4     0     1     0     0    71    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         11     5     0     2     1     1    60    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         7     3     0     0     0     0    69    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        0     5     0     1     1     0    65    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         5    27     3     0     1     1    45    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     3    41     1     2     1     2    30    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 156.056 WITH 16 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2     7     0
BRAZIL         8    64     8
ENGLAND       18    45    17
GERMANY        7    70     3
ITALY          4    71     5
JAPAN          5    60    15
MEXICO         3    69     7
CHICAGO        5    65     2

AUSTIN        27    45    10
YUGOSLAVIA    41    30     9
CHI-SQUARE 121.7 115.5  25.8
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0015
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Not applicable	(01)
2	Do work well	(02)
3	Do more than is required	(03)
4	Respect	(04)
5	Don't bother him	(05)
6	Flattery	(06)
9		(90,s)

ITEM 104 What do you think or do when criticized?

```
BRAZIL        25     2    18    20     9     0     0     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND       30    10     5    19    12     0     0     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY         25     3    15    19    12     4     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN         40     2    16     8     3     2     0     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO        15     3    26     2    29     2     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO       29    10     7    16     4     1     0     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN        24    14     4    28     9     0     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    38     5    11    11    11     1     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 623.764 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     3     4     5     8     0
BRAZIL        25    18    20     9     6     2
ENGLAND       30     5    19    12     4    10
GERMANY        0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY         25    15    19    12     2     7
JAPAN         40    16     8     3     9     4
MEXICO        15    26     2    29     2     5
CHICAGO       29     7    16     4     5    11
AUSTIN        24     4    28     9     3    14
YUGOSLAVIA    38    11    11    11     3     6
CHI-SQUARE  68.6  54.9  58.0  63.9 477.2  27.2
PROB.      .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0000 .0009
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Rational analysis + verbal rational	(01+07)
2	Takes well + laugh it off	(02+05)
3	Ignores	(03)
4	Dislikes +takes poorly	(04+10)
5	Defensive verbal + gets mad	(06+08)
6	Doesn't happen	(09)
7	Physical aggression	(11)
9		(91+93+95+99)

```
ITEM 105  By husband/wife

BRAZIL         19    11     5    17    11     7     0    10    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        20    10     6    12    17     7     1     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          19     2     6    13    26     7     0     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          47     6     6     3    14     2     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         22     7     8     7    24     8     0     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        18    11     4    16    15     4     0     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         16    17     4    17    14     3     0    11    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     35     7     4     8    21     4     0     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 524.096 WITH 40 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     4     5     8     0
BRAZIL         19    11    17    11    10    12
ENGLAND        20    10    12    17     7    14
GERMANY         0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY          19     2    13    26     7    13
JAPAN          47     6     3    14     2     8
MEXICO         22     7     7    24     3    16
CHICAGO        18    11    16    15     4     8
AUSTIN         16    17    17    14    11     7
YUGOSLAVIA     35     7     8    21     1     8
CHI-SQUARE   84.4  29.3  35.3  38.0 431.8  21.8
PROB.       .0000 .0005 .0001 .0000 .0000 .0055
```

Categories

Original Codes in Interview Manual

Same as Item 104

```
ITEM 106  What do you think or do when criticized by friends?

BRAZIL         22     6    13     8     8    11     0    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        21    10     3    13     6    23     0     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          21     2    10    13     8     7     0    19    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          28     9     5     4     2    23     0     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         22     4    22     3    21     3     0     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        22    17     8     9     4     6     0     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         17    18    12     8     5    13     0     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     25     7    14     5    10    17     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 506.902 WITH 48 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     6     8
BRAZIL         22     6    13     8     8    11    12
ENGLAND        21    10     3    13     6    23     4
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0    80
ITALY          21     2    10    13     8     7    19
JAPAN          28     9     5     4     2    23     9
MEXICO         22     4    22     3    21     3     4
CHICAGO        22    17     8     9     4     6     6
AUSTIN         17    18    12     8     5    13     9
YUGOSLAVIA     25     7    14     5    10    17     2
CHI-SQUARE   35.4  44.3  41.0  24.7  45.5  54.7 369.0
PROB.       .0001 .0000 .0000 .0021 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1.	Rational analysis+verbal rational	(01+07)
2	Takes well + laugh it off	(02+05)
3	Ignores	(03)
4	Dislikes + takes poorly	(04+10)
5	Defensive verbal + gets mad	(06+08)
6	Doesn't happen	(09)
7	Physical aggression	(11)
9		(91+93+95+99)

```
ITEM 107  What do you think or do when criticized by your own children?

BRAZIL          9    12     4    11     3     5     2     4    19     5     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         9    12     9    12     4    10     4     2    14     0     4    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        28    12     3     4     2     3    16     0    10     0     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY           6     5     3    10     5     4     9     8    14     4    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          36     5    11     2     2     4     4     2    11     1     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         16     3     6     7     1     8     1    15    13     0     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        16    21     5     8     3     3     2     0     9     0     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         11    23    10    11     0     4     7     1     9     0     6    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA     10     4     2     9     2    15     4     5    18     2     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 184.957 WITH 56 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     6     9    11     0
BRAZIL          9    12     4    11     5    19     6    14
ENGLAND         9    12     9    12    10    14     4    10
GERMANY        28    12     3     4     3    10     2    18
ITALY           6     5     3    10     4    14    12    26
JAPAN          36     5    11     2     4    11     2     9
MEXICO         16     3     6     7     8    13     9    17
CHICAGO        16    21     5     8     3     9     5     5
AUSTIN         11    23    10    11     4     9     6     8
YUGOSLAVIA     10     4     2     9    15    18     9    13
CHI-SQUARE   63.7  48.7  15.7  12.1  22.4   9.3  15.9  28.0
PROB.       .0000 .0000 .0460 .1445 .0046 .3158 .0436 .0007
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
01	Rational analysis	(01)
02	Takes well	(02)
03	Ignores	(03)
04	Dislikes	(04)
05	Laugh it off	(05)
06	Defensive verbal	(06)
07	Rational verbal	(07)
08	Get mad	(08)
09	Doesn't happen	(09)
10	Punishment	(10)
99		(90,s)

```
ITEM 108  What kinds of things make you angry?

BRAZIL         21     8     8     0    23     2    15     2     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND         5     7     5     0    19    16    23     4     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          13    12     6     0    24     0    14     6     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN           9    18     9     0    35     0     7     1     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO          8     5     1     0    50     5     7     2     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        15    18     3     0    15     8    10     3     0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         22    11     3     0    22     5    15     1     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA      2    11    15     0    33     6    10     1     2    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 756.734 WITH 48 DF.   P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     5     7     9     0
BRAZIL         21     8     8    23    15     1     4
ENGLAND         5     7     5    19    23     1    20
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY          13    12     6    24    14     5     6
JAPAN           9    18     9    35     7     1     1
MEXICO          8     5     1    50     7     1     7
CHICAGO        15    18     3    15    10     0    11
AUSTIN         22    11     3    22    15     3     6
YUGOSLAVIA      2    11    15    33    10     2     7
CHI-SQUARE   53.5  33.6  32.6  90.8  34.4 595.2  45.6
PROB.       .0000 .0001 .0002 .0000 .0001 .0000 .0000
```

Categories		Original Codes in Interview Manual
1	Petty annoyance	(01)
2	Strong annoyance +unjust accusation	(02+06)
3	Actions originating in self	(03+08+10+91)
4	Repetition of stem	(04)
5	Source of anger is child	(05)
6	Mistreatment of other people	(07)
7	Annoying behavior of others + spouse + work related problems	(09+11+12+14)
8	I don't get angry	(13)
9		(95+99)

ITEM 109 What do you usually do when you are angry?

```
BRAZIL         2     2    14    24    12    12    14    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ENGLAND        4     7    11    47     3     3     5    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     0     0    80    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
ITALY          7     5     9    33     6    11     9    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
JAPAN          0     8     9    42     1     8    12    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
MEXICO         3     6    16    34     8    11     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
CHICAGO        2     3    14    40     8     2     3    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
AUSTIN         2     3    22    33     9     6     7    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
YUGOSLAVIA    12     6    11    31     8    11     1    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0    -0
TABLE C2 = 478.397 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       3     4     5     6     7     0
BRAZIL        14    24    12    12    14     4
ENGLAND       11    47     3     3     5    11
GERMANY        0     0     0     0    80     0
ITALY          9    33     6    11     9    12
JAPAN          9    42     1     8    12     8
MEXICO        16    34     8    11     1     9
CHICAGO       14    40     8     2     3     5
AUSTIN        22    33     9     6     7     5
YUGOSLAVIA    11    31     8    11     1    10
CHI-SQUARE  28.5  81.4  22.7  24.7 410.2  30.5
PROB.      .0006 .0000 .0041 .0021 .0000 .0003
```

Categories	Original Codes in Interview Manual
1 Withdrawal	(01)
2 Hostile affect + physiological reaction	(02+07)
3 Control anger + cope actively	(03+09)
4 Verbal+physical aggression	(04+06)
5 Depresses affect	(05)
6 No action or affect	(08)
9	(91+95+97+99)

ITEM 110-1 ALTRUISM

```
BRAZIL         2     5     9    14     8    10     7     5     7     4     3     3     0     0     0     3
ENGLAND        8    13     9    12    12     8     8     3     2     2     1     0     0     2     0     0
GERMANY       11    16    17     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     1     0     0    35
ITALY         10    15     6    11     4     4     4     6     7     3     3     2     2     1     1     1
JAPAN          7     7    12    15     7     7     7     6     4     4     2     2     0     0     0     0
MEXICO        12    15     9     9     3     6     8     4     6     2     2     1     1     0     0     1
CHICAGO        8    13    11    10    10     8     2     4     0     1     0     1     0     1     0     3
AUSTIN         8     9    10    11     9     9    10     5     3     3     2     0     1     1     1     0
YUGOSLAVIA     6     9     6    11     6     9     6     9     4     4     3     0     2     2     3     0
TABLE C2 = 113.581 WITH 56 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6     7     0
BRAZIL         2     5     9    14     8    10     7    25
ENGLAND        8    13     9    12    12     8     8    10
GERMANY       11    16    17     0     0     0     0    36
ITALY         10    15     6    11     4     4     4    26
JAPAN          7     7    12    15     7     7     7    18
MEXICO        12    15     9     9     3     6     8    17
CHICAGO        8    13    11    10    10     8     2    10
AUSTIN         8     9    10    11     9     9    10    16
YUGOSLAVIA     6     9     6    11     6     9     6    27
CHI-SQUARE   9.9  13.5  10.6  16.3  19.4  12.6  14.3  36.7
PROB.      .2733 .0957 .2273 .0382 .0131 .1246 .0735 .0001
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Altruism

Category 1 == Rank 1

through

Category 7 = Rank 7

Category 0 = All other categories combined

ITEM 110-2 ESTHETICS

```
BRAZIL       ✓ 2     1     2     5     4     7    10     7     9    14     4     5     3     2     1     4
ENGLAND        2     4    12     2    10    10     6    10     6     8     4     2     2     1     1     0
GERMANY       11    10     5     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     2     0     0    52
ITALY          2     3     9     5     4     3     4     7     4     6     9    11     5     5     2     1
JAPAN          1     1     1     7     7    11     8     8     8     8     3     5     2     6     4     0
MEXICO         2     2     1     4     4     1     1     8     4     5    11    14     8     4     8     2
CHICAGO        2     3     8     4    10     8     8     4    11     5     3     1     1     1     0     3
AUSTIN         3     4     5     8     8    11     8     9     9     4     5     4     0     2     2     0
YUGOSLAVIA     1     2     5     2     5     7    12     9     8     2     7     7     8     3     2     0
TABLE C2 = 463.416 WITH 56 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       5     6     7     8     9    10    16     0
BRAZIL         4     7    10     7     9    14     4    25
ENGLAND       10    10     6    10     6     8     0    30
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     0     0    52    28
ITALY          4     3     4     7     4     6     1    51
JAPAN          7    11     8     8     8     8     0    30
MEXICO         4     1     1     8     4     5     2    54
CHICAGO       10     8     8     4    11     5     3    23
AUSTIN         8    11     8     9     9     4     0    33
YUGOSLAVIA     5     7    12     9     8     2     0    37
CHI-SQUARE  17.1  23.5  22.1  11.5  16.5  23.9 362.7  47.3
PROB.      .0291 .0031 .0051 .1723 .0357 .0027 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Esthetics

Category 5 = Rank 5

through

Category 10 = Rank 10

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-3    INDEPENDENCE

BRAZIL         3    9    7    4    9    9   13    9    4    1    5    3    1    0    0    3
ENGLAND        0    2    8    4    5   11   10    8    9    8    7    3    1    2    2    0
GERMANY        0    2    6    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    4    3    1   64
ITALY          4    1    6   12   14    9    8    9    4    2    2    2    3    3    1    0
JAPAN          8   16    9    5    8   11    6    3    6    2    2    1    2    0    1    0
MEXICO         4    7    4    7    4   13   10    8    5    8    3    3    1    1    0    1
CHICAGO        0    6    5    4    7    4    4    9    6   11    6    2    1    1    3    3
AUSTIN         1    4    5    2    9    9   10    7   13   10    3    2    3    3    1    0
YUGOSLAVIA     5    8   10    9    7    4    9    8    7    7    3    0    2    1    0    0
TABLE C2 = 574.522 WITH 64 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2     3     5     6     7     8     9    16     0
BRAZIL         9     7     9     9    13     9     4     3    17
ENGLAND        2     8     5    11    10     8     9     0    27
GERMANY        2     6     0     0     0     0     0    64     8
ITALY          1     6    14     9     8     9     4     0    29
JAPAN         16     9     8    11     6     3     6     0    21
MEXICO         7     4     4    13    10     8     5     1    27
CHICAGO        6     5     7     4     4     9     6     3    28
AUSTIN         4     5     9     9    10     7    13     0    25
YUGOSLAVIA     8    10     7     4     9     8     7     0    27
CHI-SQUARE  30.9   4.9  18.5  19.5  16.5  13.4  18.0 495.0  24.8
PROB.      .0003 .7657 .0176 .0125 .0356 .0972 .0209 .0000 .0020
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Independence

Category 2 = Rank 2

through

Category 9 = Rank 9

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-4    MANAGEMENT

BRAZIL         1    2    1    5    6    4    8    7   10    8    8    8    3    2    3    4
ENGLAND        1    5    3    3    5    7    6    4    9    9   10    8    7    3    0    0
GERMANY        1    2    5    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    4    5    0   63
ITALY          2    3    6    1    5    2    8    2    5   10    9   11    9    2    5    0
JAPAN          1    5    9    2    4    5    5    6    9    8    7    6    7    6    0    0
MEXICO         2    4    5    2    2    9    6    5   10    7    5    8    4    4    4    2
CHICAGO        3    1    3    2    5    5    3    5    7    6    9    5   10    4    1    3
AUSTIN         1    0    1    2    4    2    5   11    7    5    9   11   13    7    4    0
YUGOSLAVIA     3    4    1    3   10    9    7    7    8    3    5    7    5    5    3    0
TABLE C2 = 507.165 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       9    10    11    12    13    16     0
BRAZIL        10     8     8     8     3     4    39
ENGLAND        9     9    10     8     7     0    37
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     4    63    13
ITALY          5    10     9    11     9     0    36
JAPAN          9     8     7     6     7     0    43
MEXICO        10     7     5     8     4     2    43
CHICAGO        7     6     9     5    10     3    32
AUSTIN         7     5     9    11    13     0    37
YUGOSLAVIA     8     3     5     7     5     0    52
CHI-SQUARE  12.1  13.8  12.9  13.0  14.2 470.5  44.5
PROB.      .1446 .0856 .1144 .1110 .0775 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Management

Category 9 = Rank 9

through

Category 13 = Rank 13

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-5    SUCCESS

BRAZIL         1    2    1    0    0    2    0    2    3    0    3    7   17   13   26    3
ENGLAND        1    0    1    1    1    1    1    2    4    3    5    5   16   12   27    0
GERMANY        0    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0   18   10   23   28
ITALY          0    0    4    1    1    1    2    1    7    5    5   14    9   14   16    0
JAPAN          2    2    2    3    0    0    6    5    7    6    5    6   19    8    9    0
MEXICO         0    1    1    1    0    0    2    8    3    4    6    8    6   15   23    1
CHICAGO        0    0    1    0    0    1    0    0    2    5    9   11    6    8   26    3
AUSTIN         1    0    0    0    0    1    0    2    2    2    7   11    8   13   35    0
YUGOSLAVIA     0    1    2    0    1    1    0    1    3   13    4   13   21    6   14    0
TABLE C2 =  84.869 WITH 32 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY      12    13    14    15     0
BRAZIL         7    17    13    26    17
ENGLAND        5    16    12    27    20
GERMANY        0    18    10    23    29
ITALY         14     9    14    16    27
JAPAN          6    19     8     9    38
MEXICO         8     6    15    23    27
CHICAGO       11     6     8    26    21
AUSTIN        11     8    13    35    15
YUGOSLAVIA    13    21     6    14    26
CHI-SQUARE  21.4  24.6   7.6  31.4  23.2
PROB.      .0064 .0022 .5304 .0003 .0035
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Success

Category 12 = Rank 12

through

Category 15 = Rank 15

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-6    SELF-SATISFACTION

BRAZIL         7    7    7    2    4    5    4    5    6    9    3    9    6    1    2    3
ENGLAND        6    3    1    2    3    4    7   10   11    7    7    7    4    7    1    0
GERMANY        4    2    2    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    3    3    0   66
ITALY         12    7    7    4    7    1    5    6    7    8    3    3    3    4    2    1
JAPAN          7    5    7    3    7    3    4    6    8   10    6    3    2    6    3    0
MEXICO         9    6    6    6    4    5    4    3    6   13    6    4    2    3    1    1
CHICAGO        2    5    5    6    3    3    5    1    4   10    5    9    6    2    3    3
AUSTIN         3    7    6    8    1    4    6   14    5    8    1    9    5    5    0    0
YUGOSLAVIA     9   10    7    6    9    8    4    4    9    3    3    3    2    1    2    0
TABLE C2 = 539.762 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     9    10    16     0
BRAZIL         7     7     6     9     3    48
ENGLAND        6     3    11     7     0    53
GERMANY        4     2     0     0    66     8
ITALY         12     7     7     8     1    45
JAPAN          7     5     8    10     0    50
MEXICO         9     6     6    13     1    44
CHICAGO        2     5     4    10     3    48
AUSTIN         3     7     5     8     0    59
YUGOSLAVIA     9    10     9     3     0    49
CHI-SQUARE  13.1   8.3  13.4  18.7 505.6  86.9
PROB.      .1073 .4096 .0975 .0167 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Self-Satisfaction

Categories 1, 2, 9, and 10 ==

Ranks 1, 2, 9, and 10 respectively

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-7    INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION

BRAZIL         24    11     9     6     3     7     7     1     2     3     2     0     1     1     0     3
ENGLAND         8    14    15     5    11     7     3     3     3     6     3     1     0     1     0     0
GERMANY         7     8     8     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     1     0     0    56
ITALY          14    11     7     9     6     8     8     6     1     3     0     3     1     1     2     0
JAPAN          17     8     4     7    10     5     6     8     6     3     5     0     0     0     1     0
MEXICO         13     4     6     4     9     4    15     7     6     2     3     2     0     2     1     1
CHICAGO        16    11     7     6    10     7     6     1     0     0     1     1     1     1     1     3
AUSTIN         12    14    13    10     7    13     4     3     2     1     0     1     0     1     1     0
YUGOSLAVIA     10     8    11    11    10     6     5     5     4     3     3     2     1     1     0     0
TABLE C2 = 519.744 WITH 64 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY        1     2     3     4     5     6     7    16     0
BRAZIL         24    11     9     6     3     7     7     3    10
ENGLAND         8    14    15     5    11     7     3     0    17

GERMANY         7     8     8     0     0     0     0    56     1
ITALY          14    11     7     9     6     8     8     0    17
JAPAN          17     8     4     7    10     5     6     0    23
MEXICO         13     4     6     4     9     4    15     1    23
CHICAGO        16    11     7     6    10     7     6     3     6
AUSTIN         12    14    13    10     7    13     4     0     9
YUGOSLAVIA     10     8    11    11    10     6     5     0    19
CHI-SQUARE   20.2   9.5  11.8  14.8  17.6  16.0  24.9 420.6  40.7
PROB.       .0099 .3005 .1619 .0633 .0244 .0425 .0020 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Intellectual Stimulation

Category 1 = Rank 1

through

Category 7 = Rank 7

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-8    CREATIVITY

BRAZIL          0     0     1     2     5     4     2     4     5     6    13    11     7     7     7     6
ENGLAND         0     1     0     1     2     1     5     9     4     5    13    16     9     9     5     0
GERMANY         0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0    15    21     5    39
ITALY           2     2     4     4     4     5     3     5     6     6    11     6    12     5     4     1
JAPAN           0     0     1     0     4     4     6     7     5    10    11    16     4     7     5     0
MEXICO          0     1     2     4     4     3     1     3     5     8    13    12    10     5     6     2
CHICAGO         1     0     2     1     1     4     5     6     8     7     7     6     8    11     2     3
AUSTIN          2     1     2     4     2     9     7     6     6    11    15     5     5     4     3     0
YUGOSLAVIA      2     1     2     2     3     2     4     4     2     7     7    14     8    11    11     0
TABLE C2 = 341.318 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       10    11    12    13    14    16     0
BRAZIL          6    13    11     7     7     6    30
ENGLAND         5    13    16     9     9     0    28
GERMANY         0     0     0    15    21    39     5
ITALY           6    11     6    12     5     1    39
JAPAN          10    11    16     4     7     0    32
MEXICO          8    13    12    10     5     2    29
CHICAGO         7     7     6     8    11     3    30
AUSTIN         11    15     5     5     4     0    42
YUGOSLAVIA      7     7    14     8    11     0    33
CHI-SQUARE   12.9  18.7  28.9  11.9  28.0 241.0  45.7
PROB.       .1158 .0164 .0005 .1530 .0007 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Creativity

Category 10 = Rank 10

through

Category 14 = Rank 14

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-9    SECURITY

BRAZIL          0     2     0     0     1     0     0     1     4     5     7     5    14    21    17     3
ENGLAND         2     2     2     6     1     2     2     5     2     5     5     8    18    10    10     0
GERMANY         1     1     1     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     8    12     9    48
ITALY           2     2     1     0     0     2     4     7     2     5     7     5     6    11    26     0
JAPAN           1     1     1     1     0     4     0     4     1     2    10     5     9    11    30     0
MEXICO          1     0     2     3     3     3     1     4     5     6     2     5     9    17    16     2
CHICAGO         0     1     1     1     3     1     6     5     6     2     9     8     9    12     5     3
AUSTIN          3     1     1     2     3     1     3     1     4     4     9     8    13    17    12     0
YUGOSLAVIA      2     1     0     0     0     0     2     4     6     6    12    10     7    13    17     0
TABLE C2 = 423.936 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       11    12    13    14    15    16     0
BRAZIL          7     5    14    21    17     3    13
ENGLAND         5     8    18    10    10     0    29
GERMANY         0     0     8    12     9    48     3
ITALY           7     5     6    11    26     0    25
JAPAN          10     5     9    11    30     0    15
MEXICO          2     5     9    17    16     2    28

CHICAGO         9     8     9    12     5     3    26
AUSTIN          9     8    13    17    12     0    23
YUGOSLAVIA     12    10     7    13    17     0    21
CHI-SQUARE   19.6  12.6  12.8   9.2  39.2 341.1  40.2
PROB.       .0122 .1251 .1172 .3277 .0000 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Security

Category 11 = Rank 11

through

Category 15 = Rank 15

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-10   PRESTIGE

BRAZIL         2    7    4    5    6    2    5    6    6    7    6    8    4    4    5    3
ENGLAND        4    3    3    2    0    4    4    5    8   10    6    4    6   12    9    0
GERMANY        0    1    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0   10    7    4   58
ITALY          3   10    9    2    4    5    3    4    8    4    7    2    4    9    5    1
JAPAN          8    6    2    7    6    2    5    5    8    6    9    6    3    4    3    0
MEXICO         4    6    9    3    6    2    5    5    8    5    4    4    8    7    2    1
CHICAGO        2    0    1    2    0    3    3    9    8   10    8    7    6    8    2    3
AUSTIN         4    1    4    2    5    2    3    8   12   12    9    9    9    0    2    0
YUGOSLAVIA     4    5    1    3    1    4    6    5    7    5    6    6    5   10   12    0
TABLE C2 = 494.051 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       9    10    11    13    14    16     0
BRAZIL         6     7     6     4     4     3    50
ENGLAND        8    10     6     6    12     0    38
GERMANY        0     0     0    10     7    58     5
ITALY          8     4     7     4     9     1    47
JAPAN          8     6     9     3     4     0    50
MEXICO         8     5     4     8     7     1    46
CHICAGO        8    10     8     6     8     3    29
AUSTIN        12    12     9     9     0     0    40
YUGOSLAVIA     7     5     6     5    10     0    47
CHI-SQUARE  12.0  18.5  11.4   8.2  17.5 431.0  81.2
PROB.      .1520 .0178 .1795 .4193 .0256 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Prestige

Category 9 = Rank 9

through

Category 14 = Rank 14

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-11   ECONOMIC RETURNS

BRAZIL        15    7    6    6    4    9    5    9    5    3    5    1    1    0    1    3
ENGLAND        8    6    4    8    6    2    8    2    9    5    5    8    4    1    4    0
GERMANY        3    9    8    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    0    0   59
ITALY          6    5    5    8    4    6    5    6    7    8    4    5    7    2    1    1
JAPAN          1    1    1    0    3    1    1    1    4   10   11   12   11   14    9    0
MEXICO        13   11    8    8    7    9    6    3    4    3    4    1    0    0    1    1
CHICAGO        5    3    6    7    2    7   10    7   10    2    1    6    1    0    2    3
AUSTIN         2    8    8    5    9    5    8    7    5    6    4    4    5    6    0    0
YUGOSLAVIA     7    4   10    7    9    5    6    5    6   10    1    3    2    1    4    0
TABLE C2 = 526.250 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     9    16     0
BRAZIL        15     7     6     5     3    44
ENGLAND        8     6     4     9     0    53
GERMANY        3     9     8     0    59     1
ITALY          6     5     5     7     1    56
JAPAN          1     1     1     4     0    73
MEXICO        13    11     8     4     1    42
CHICAGO        5     3     6    10     3    45
AUSTIN         2     8     8     5     0    59
YUGOSLAVIA     7     4    10     6     0    53
CHI-SQUARE  29.7  13.5   9.9  15.0 440.2 160.6

PROB.      .0004 .0944 .2706 .0589 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Economic Returns

Category 1 = Rank 1

through

Category 9 = Rank 9

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-12   SURROUNDINGS

BRAZIL         3    5    5    4    5    7    6    8    5   11    7    6    1    3    1    3
ENGLAND        8    4    5    9    8    6    8   10    6    5    3    2    4    1    1    0
GERMANY        3   10   16    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    0    1    0   50
ITALY          4    3    4    5    5    6    6    5    6    4   11    3    7    7    3    1
JAPAN         11   13   13   11    6   10    8    2    3    0    1    1    1    0    0    0
MEXICO         6    5    7    1    9    8    3    7    6    6    5    2   10    3    0    1
CHICAGO        1    5    2   10    5    4    6    8    3    3    7    3    8    3    1    3
AUSTIN         7    4    4    5    9    6    9    3    3   10   10    3    3    3    3    0
YUGOSLAVIA     8    5    6    8    6    5    2    3    3    7   11    6    2    8    0    0
TABLE C2 = 494.236 WITH 64 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6    11    16     0
BRAZIL         3     5     5     4     5     7     7     3    41
ENGLAND        8     4     5     9     8     6     3     0    37
GERMANY        3    10    16     0     0     0     0    50     1
ITALY          4     3     4     5     5     6    11     1    41
JAPAN         11    13    13    11     6    10     1     0    15
MEXICO         6     5     7     1     9     8     5     1    37
CHICAGO        1     5     2    10     5     4     7     3    35
AUSTIN         7     4     4     5     9     6    10     0    37
YUGOSLAVIA     8     5     6     8     6     5    11     0    31
CHI-SQUARE  14.4  15.3  26.0  23.3  10.8  11.2  24.4 358.6  80.0
PROB.      .0714 .0537 .0013 .0033 .2105 .1927 .0023 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Surroundings

Category 1 = Rank 1

through

Category 11 = Rank 11

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-13    ASSOCIATES

BRAZIL         0     0     0     1     2     0     2     3     5     3     6     7    17    20    10     4
ENGLAND        1     1     0     1     0     2     1     3     4     3     6    14     7    18    19     0
GERMANY        0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0    11    15    36    18
ITALY          3     1     3     2     2     4     3     2     7    10     7    11     8     9     7     1
JAPAN          1     2     0     1     0     0     1     5     4     4     5    15    15    15    12     0
MEXICO         4     2     1     5     4     1     1     2     0     3     8     6    13    14    14     1
CHICAGO        0     1     1     0     0     0     3     1     2     4     3     9    13    15    16     4
AUSTIN         0     0     0     0     0     0     0     1     6     5     7    13    15    19    16     0
YUGOSLAVIA     0     0     1     2     0     3     2     3     6     6    13     6    13    14    11     0
TABLE C2 = 105.995 WITH 40 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY      11    12    13    14    15     0
BRAZIL         6     7    17    20    10    20
ENGLAND        6    14     7    18    19    16
GERMANY        0     0    11    15    36    18
ITALY          7    11     8     9     7    38
JAPAN          5    15    15    15    12    18
MEXICO         8     6    13    14    14    24
CHICAGO        3     9    13    15    16    16
AUSTIN         7    13    15    19    16    12
YUGOSLAVIA    13     6    13    14    11    23
CHI-SQUARE  17.2  22.6   8.3   6.7  45.1  29.0
PROB.      .0275 .0042 .4046 .5730 .0000 .0005
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Associates

Category 11 = Rank 11

through

Category 15 = Rank 15

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-14  VARIETY

BRAZIL         6     7    14    10    13     2     5     6     4     3     1     5     1     0     0     3
ENGLAND       11    10    11    11     9     8     6     3     2     4     3     1     1     0     0     0
GERMANY        3     6     7     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     1     2     1    60
ITALY          1     7     5     7    13    13    12     5     5     2     1     1     1     4     2     1
JAPAN          5     3     7     7     8     8     9     8     6     4     3     2     5     3     2     0
MEXICO         3     4     5     7     8     6     8     8     8     5     4     5     3     2     2     1
CHICAGO        5     9     9     9     8    11     7     5     2     2     0     0     0     0     1     4
AUSTIN         8     7    13    16    10     6     6     5     5     1     0     2     1     1     1     0
YUGOSLAVIA     3     7     5     7     7    13    10     9     6     4     1     1     2     4     1     0
TABLE C2 = 517.493 WITH 56 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       2     3     4     5     6     7    16     0
BRAZIL         7    14    10    13     2     5     3    26
ENGLAND       10    11    11     9     8     6     0    25
GERMANY        6     7     0     0     0     0    60     7
ITALY          7     5     7    13    13    12     1    22
JAPAN          3     7     7     8     8     9     0    38
MEXICO         4     5     7     8     6     8     1    40
CHICAGO        9     9     9     8    11     7     4    15
AUSTIN         7    13    16    10     6     6     0    24
YUGOSLAVIA     7     5     7     7    13    10     0    31
CHI-SQUARE   6.8  12.7  19.2  15.4  25.3  14.7 442.5  48.2
PROB.      .5566 .1204 .0138 .0513 .0017 .0638 .0000 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Variety

Category 2 = Rank 2

through

Category 7 = Rank 7

Category 16 = No information

Category 0 = All other categories combined

```
ITEM 110-15    FOLLOW FATHER

BRAZIL        11    12    11    13     7     9     4     4     2     1     1     0     0     1     0     4
ENGLAND       21    13     5    13     7     7     5     4     1     1     1     1     1     0     0     0
GERMANY       35    11     4     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0    30
ITALY         15     9     5     8     6    12     4     7     4     2     2     1     2     2     1     0
JAPAN         10    10    10    11    10     9     8     6     2     2     1     0     1     0     0     0
MEXICO         7    10    12    13    11     8     7     3     3     0     1     1     2     0     0     1
CHICAGO       25    12     8     7     5     4     2     3     0     1     0     0     0     0     1     4
AUSTIN        27    23    11     7     6     5     3     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0     0
YUGOSLAVIA    20    15    13     9     7     4     5     4     0     0     1     2     0     0     0     0
TABLE C2 = 128.859 WITH 48 DF.  P = .0000

CATEGORY       1     2     3     4     5     6     0
BRAZIL        11    12    11    13     7     9    17
ENGLAND       21    13     5    13     7     7    14
GERMANY       35    11     4     0     0     0    30
ITALY         15     9     5     8     6    12    25
JAPAN         10    10    10    11    10     9    20
MEXICO         7    10    12    13    11     8    18
CHICAGO       25    12     8     7     5     4    11
AUSTIN        27    23    11     7     6     5     3
YUGOSLAVIA    20    15    13     9     7     4    12
CHI-SQUARE  47.1  12.3  11.5  17.5  12.8  16.8  37.7
PROB.      .0000 .1364 .1739 .0249 .1177 .0318 .0000
```

Frequencies of Mothers ranking Follow Father

Category 1 = Rank 1

through

Category 6 = Rank 6

Category 0 = All other categories combined

SECTION III

FINDINGS: INTER-COUNTRY COMPARISONS

Description of the Sample

In every city, over fifty percent of the children sampled lived with both their parents. Percentages ranged from ninety-six percent in Austin to fifty-six percent in Tokyo. In Tokyo, thirty-three percent of those sampled lived with one parent and a relative, with Ljubljana and Mexico City having the next highest percentage in this category, twenty-four percent and nineteen percent respectively. In only thirteen percent of the Sao Paulo sample did the child live with one parent and a relative; but another twenty-eight percent lived with one parent and a non-relative. This was by far the highest percentage in this latter category, the nearest being Tokyo with eleven percent.

There were significant differences among the cities concerning who took the main responsibility for the child. For eighty-nine percent of the Tokyo sample and seventy-one percent of the Milan sample, responsibility was taken by the mother alone. Results from London, Germany, Mexico City and Chicago indicated that the mother, alone, took main responsibility for over half the children in the sample. In the case of Ljubljana this figure was less than a third (thirty-one percent). Austin and Ljubljana were the only two cities where for over half the sample responsibility was said to rest with both parents There is a large difference here between the two American cities, Austin and Chicago In the Chicago communities, only twenty-one percent of the sample had responsibility assigned to both parents while for sixty-eight percent of the sample responsibility rested with the mother alone. In Austin the corresponding figures were fifty-four percent and forty-six percent.

The question concerning the birthplace of the mother produced a number of significant differences. The London sample showed the least geographic mobility, sixty-three percent of the mothers being born in the London area. On the other hand only one of the mothers interviewed in Tokyo had been born there. Both the Austin and Ljubljana samples showed a high degree of movement from rural to urban areas, forty-one percent and fifty-eight percent respectively of the samples interviewed showing this type of mobility. Sao Paulo, London and Chicago had no respondents in this category and Tokyo and Mexico City only one each. Germany was the only country where the respondents divided more or less evenly across the categories.

Birthplace of father showed approximately the same significant differences among cities as had occurred in the case of the mother. The pattern for Ljubljana was a little different, twice as many fathers being born in the city as mothers. Forty-four percent of the fathers came from rural areas as opposed to fifty-eight percent of the mothers.

There were no significant differences in the distribution of the ages of mother or father. In Sao Paulo, Milan, Germany, London and Chicago the highest percentage of mothers came in the forty to forty-four year old group, while in Tokyo, Mexico City, Austin and Ljubljana the largest percentages were in the thirty-five to thirty-nine year old group. London had the highest percentage (fifteen percent) in the fifty to sixty-four age group while Mexico City and Austin had the youngest mothers (fifteen percent).

In the case of the fathers the pattern is a little different. In Sao Paulo, Milan and Mexico City the highest percentages came in the forty-five to forty-nine year old group, while in the other cities the highest percentages were in the forty to forty-four year old group. Mexico City and Ljubljana had the youngest as well as the oldest fathers.

Only in Ljubljana and London did any appreciable percentage of mothers work outside the home. Milan and Mexico City had the greatest number of mothers not working.

When only father's occupation and not his educational level was taken into account, significant differences occurred. Sao Paulo had more respondents at the extremes of the occupational scale, twenty-nine percent in the highest category, one, and thirty-three percent in the lowest categories, five and six. Germany, on the other hand, had only two fathers in category one and none in categories five and six.

In Germany, Chicago and Austin significantly more mothers had a university education than in other cities. In Sao Paulo, London, Germany, Milan and Ljubljana more mothers had left school at fifteen than had mothers in other cities.

A far greater proportion of fathers than mothers had had a university education. This was true of all cities, the biggest differences being in Sao Paulo, Mexico City and Tokyo.

In terms of recent geographical mobility the Tokyo sample was by far the most stable, almost fifty percent having lived in their present home for over fifteen years. In Chicago and Sao Paulo only fourteen percent came in this category.

Thirty percent or more of children in all cities had never been in the hospital and those who had, had only been in for short periods of time. London had the smallest percentage of children who had not been in the hospital (thirty-six percent) while Tokyo had the highest (seventy-six percent).

There were no significant differences among cities on the question of whether either parent had lived away from home for six months or more. In all cities eighty percent or more of the sample answered "No" to this question.

Child Development Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

This series of questions in the interview was aimed at obtaining a picture of the child's academic standing and his manner of tackling academic problems as perceived by the mother.

When asked to describe their child in terms of his schoolwork parents in the nine stations differed significantly in the type of response they gave. In Sao Paulo, Milan and Austin between thirty and forty percent of the parents described their child in terms of positive achievement. In Germany and Tokyo, on the other hand, thirty-six and forty-three percent respectively described their child's achievement as neutral or average. In London, Mexico City and Chicago no one type of description was favored, the highest percentage category being that of individual response. The only category which showed no significant differences among cities was that of negative achievement. In all cities, only a small percentage of mothers gave this answer.

When asked how their child felt about school, a majority of respondents in all cities except Milan indicated that the child had a positive feeling. There were, however, significant differences in the "strongly positive" category. Germany and Tokyo had only six and nine percent, respectively, here, while Sao Paulo and Ljubljana had over thirty percent of their respondents in this category.

Questions concerning homework produced some interesting results. In all but three stations--London, Germany and Milan--more than twenty-five percent of the mothers indicated that their children did not have any homework. The figure was as high as sixty-six percent in Sao Paulo. In London and Germany only about eight percent of the children did not have any homework, while in Milan the figure was sixteen percent. It should be remembered that the sample contained both ten- and fourteen-year-old children and it might be expected that quite large numbers in the younger age group would not have homework though this could account, at most, for only fifty percent of the sample. Some sharp contrasts appeared among countries for those children who did have homework. Only four percent of Tokyo mothers reported that their children sometimes did not do their homework, but twenty-eight percent of Austin children either did not do it at all or put it off as long as possible. Mexico City was very similar to Tokyo while Milan and London followed the Austin pattern.

Cities also differed significantly on the mother's report of how the child tackled his homework. Austin and Chicago had the lowest percentages in the self-initiation category, while Tokyo was the highest with ninety percent. No other country approached Tokyo in this regard, Ljubljana, London and Mexico City having the next highest percentages, fifty-three, fifty-four and fifty-eight percent respectively.

However, on the whole, the results showed that children in most cities did get down to their homework after slight pressure from parents. The exception was London, where over twenty-six percent of the children had to be reminded to do their homework and be supervised till it was done.

From the responses given to other questions it would have been expected that children in Tokyo would seldom or never put off their homework to do other things. However, this did not seem to be the case. Milan had the highest percentage (sixty-six percent) in this category while Tokyo had only nineteen percent. Thirty-four percent of the Tokyo sample seldom put off their homework to do other things and only eighteen percent did so frequently. In Austin, on the other hand, fifty-nine percent seldom or never put it off, according to their mothers.

Children who made a mistake in their homework showed significantly different patterns of behavior in the cities studied. With the exception of London where twenty-one percent would not do it again, ninety percent of all children in all cities would correct their mistake but with different degrees of emotional expression. In Ljubljana the response of over seventy-five percent of the children involved no emotion whatever. They would just sit down and redo the work. In Austin, however, twenty-three percent of the sample would be unhappy or upset while in Germany the same percentage expressed anger before starting again. Tokyo children expressed almost no emotion, either depressed or angry.

II. Occupational and Educational Aspiration

The questions in this area were aimed at obtaining an assessment of parents' aspirations and expectations for the child.

Significant differences occurred for both the parent's educational aspiration and her actual expectation for the child. Eighty-eight percent of the Austin sample wanted their child to go to the university. This contrasts with London where only thirty percent of the sample aspired to this level. Tokyo came closest to Austin with sixty-six percent of the sample aspiring to a university education for their children. In all other stations except Germany (thirty-nine percent), over half the mothers would like their child to have a university education.

It was only in Germany and Milan that any large number of mothers aspired to only some college education as the educational limit for their child. It was only in Sao Paulo and Mexico City that as many as fourteen percent of the parents were willing to leave it to the child's preference.

There was some discrepancy between level of aspiration and level of expectation within countries. Among countries, however, the same differences appeared for expectation as for aspiration. The Austin sample showed the highest expectation level, with Tokyo second, and London having the lowest percentage of mothers expecting their child to have a university education.

While almost every mother was able to indicate her educational aspiration for her child, some mothers in all cities had difficulty in giving an educational expectation level. The number differed significantly among cities. Twenty percent of London mothers said they did not know how far their child would go in school while only two Tokyo mothers gave this response. Chicago was closest to London, with fourteen percent of mothers indicating that they did not know. Other cities were closer to the Tokyo pattern.

Some inter-city differences occurred on the question concerning parent's occupational aspiration for the child. In Sao Paulo, Milan and Mexico City, thirty-eight, twenty-eight, and forty percent of the mothers aspired to top level, upper-middle class jobs for their children. London had the lowest percentage (six percent) and none of the other cities had more than thirteen percent of their mothers in this first category.

In Austin and Milan thirty percent of the mothers aspired to a lower-middle class occupation for their children, but in Sao Paulo, Germany, London and Chicago this was popular with only fourteen percent of the mothers.

There were significant differences, also, for occupational level two, which was also in the upper-middle class range. This proved most popular with Ljubljana and Germany.

The same drop in level from aspiration to expectation as occurred for education also occurred for occupation. While the expectation level in category one was still high for Sao Paulo and Mexico City (twenty-five percent), it dropped to ten percent in Milan.

In all cities, a quarter or more of the mothers said they had no preference or didn't know what they expected their child's occupation to be. This number differed significantly among cities being as high as fifty-nine percent in London and Germany and twenty-four to twenty-five percent in Tokyo, Austin and Ljubljana.

When asked what type of work they thought their child would like to take up, significantly more mothers in London and Chicago than in other cities indicated that they did not know what their child wanted. Mothers in Ljubljana and Milan seemed closer to their children in this regard, only three percent and five percent respectively saying they did not know.

III. Nonacademic Activities

In all cities nearly every mother was able to name at least one activity in which her child engaged but there were significant differences among cities on the number of these activities. Austin, London and Sao Paulo had the highest percentages of children with five or more activities while Milan, Tokyo and Mexico City were the cities where significantly more children had only one or two activities mentioned by their mother.

Three activities seemed to account for approximately twenty-five percent of the children in most cities, there being no significant differences for this category.

When the question was the more specific one of joint activities of child and parent, significantly more mothers in London, Milan and Tokyo indicated a lack of interaction or interaction of a negative nature, for example, they "fought" or "did not like each other very much." This occurred rarely in Sao Paulo, Mexico City and Ljubljana and in about nine percent of cases in the American samples.

Where interaction of a positive type did occur, more children in Sao Paulo, Mexico City and particularly Ljubljana (sixty-four percent) engaged in some work activity with their mother. Greatest verbal interaction took place in Germany and Mexico City while London, Germany, Tokyo, Chicago and Austin had the highest percentages of responses mentioning nonverbal, non-work activity.

When the question dealt with activities with the father, Milan, Mexico and Tokyo had significantly more responses in the negative interaction category. Only Germany, Austin and Chicago had low percentages here. On the whole, the pattern was somewhat similar to that of activities with the mother though there was not the same emphasis on constructive work activities. As was true of interaction with the mother, Ljubljana had the highest percentage in the constructive work category (thirty-six percent) with Milan, Tokyo and Chicago being significantly lower. Greatest verbal interaction took place in Germany, Milan and Ljubljana while Austin, Germany, Tokyo and Chicago had the highest percentage of responses mentioning nonverbal, non-work activity.

When it came to activities with the family, thirty-eight percent of London mothers mentioned vacations. With the exception of Chicago and Austin, with eighteen and ten percent respectively, this type of activity was almost never mentioned by mothers in other cities.

In a similar way conversation and meals were listed by thirty-eight percent of Ljubljana mothers and twenty-five percent of Milanese mothers but not often by mothers in other cities. Tokyo had the highest percentage listing indoor games and television as the main family activity, while Austin had significantly more mothers who mentioned outings as the main activity with the family. There was quite a big difference here from Tokyo and Milan where the percentages were fourteen percent and sixteen percent.

Significantly more mothers in Mexico City indicated a complete absence of interaction.

Significantly more children in Tokyo, Mexico City and Ljubljana did not belong to clubs or organizations of any sort. Austin and Chicago both had almost seventy-five percent of the respondents having some group affiliation. Of those who did belong to some sort of club Sao Paulo, Germany and Mexico City had significantly more responses for sports clubs while children in London, Milan, Chicago and Austin belonged to organized groups like scouts or church youth groups.

The responses to the question concerning the child's hobbies brought out a highly significant difference between Milan and Tokyo. Fifty-six percent of Milanese children were reported as having no hobbies but only five percent of Tokyo children came in this category. Sao Paulo and Mexico City were closest to Milan with thirty-five percent and forty percent.

When these children with a hobby were considered, mothers in London and Mexico City reported more interest in sport while Tokyo children showed more interest in cultural and academic hobbies. Chicago had the highest percentage of children with a cultural hobby.

In every city except Milan at least seventy-five percent of the children in the sample had jobs or chores around the house. In Milan only thirteen percent of the children came in this category.

Cleaning the house was mentioned significantly more often by mothers in Chicago and Austin while helping parents generally was specified significantly more by mothers in Tokyo and Mexico City. Significantly more children in Germany than elsewhere took an active part in dishwashing.

As far as reasons for having a job around the house were concerned, significantly more mothers in Sao Paulo and Ljubljana stressed helping parents while significantly more in Tokyo looked on it as a duty. To teach responsibility was given significantly more often as a reason by parents in Mexico City, Chicago and Austin.

Significantly more children in Sao Paulo and Austin never or seldom had to be reminded to do their chores. Germany and Ljubljana had the greatest numbers needing frequent reminders.

Of those children who did have jobs around the house well over fifty percent were reported by the mothers as doing them by themselves. Significantly more children in Austin and Ljubljana tried to get their siblings to do the job for them.

Mothers in Tokyo and Mexico City were less inclined to praise their child's performance on these tasks. They regarded the performance as satisfactory rather than good or excellent.

Significantly more children in Sao Paulo and London never helped around the house unless asked to do so but significantly more children in Sao Paulo than in any other city always helped around the house without being asked. Forty-three percent of the Milanese sample always or frequently helped without being asked indicating that although previous questions had shown no regular jobs for these children they did nevertheless help in the house.

IV. Authority

Significantly more mothers in London and Tokyo found it difficult to give a firm response about their child's reaction to authority. They indicated it would all depend on the situation or on the mood the child was in at the time. However, thirty-one percent in London and thirty-four percent in Ljubljana indicated that their children would react positively if corrected while significantly more in Sao Paulo, Milan and Chicago indicated a negative reaction. More children in Germany and Tokyo reacted neutrally in such a situation--that is, they obeyed without any indication of positive or negative feeling. Only in Mexico City did a significant number of mothers (twenty-eight percent) indicate an emotional reaction without any indication of whether the child obeyed or not.

Although children in the different cities showed various reactions in a disciplinary situation there were no significant differences in one category that of "Takes well or apologizes," most cities having approximately twenty-five percent of their responses in this category. However, significantly more mothers in Germany and Austin reported their children as either sulking or withdrawing from the situation altogether, while thirty percent of the Mexico City sample became hostile in both verbal and nonverbal ways. In Milan and Ljubljana significantly more children reacted by crying than in other cities. An interesting point here was the significantly higher number of mothers in London and Tokyo who indicated that they never punished their children (twenty-five percent and forty-four percent). For all cities the number of fathers who did not punish their children was higher than for mothers but again London and Tokyo were significantly higher than other cities (twenty-six percent and fifty-six percent). Of the children who were disciplined by their father and gave some reaction, no significant inter-city differences occurred for the positive acceptance category. As with the mother, significantly more children in Germany sulked, while more Milanese children reacted by crying. More children in Sao Paulo and Mexico City reacted in a hostile way.

Nearly all mothers in all cities indicated criticizing their child at some time. Significantly more mothers in Milan and Tokyo indicated that the child's reaction to criticism would depend very much on the situation. More children in Sao Paulo would make excuses or argue (twenty-six percent) while significantly more in Mexico City would lose their temper. Over twenty-five percent of the children in Milan, Tokyo and Mexico City were reported as reacting positively to criticism but thirty-three percent and thirty-six percent respectively in Austin and Ljubljana reacted by being hurt, ashamed or by crying.

Fewer fathers criticized their children, their numbers being significantly greater in Tokyo and Mexico City. Of the children so criticized, more reacted positively in Milan and Tokyo than in other cities while more children in Germany, Austin and Ljubljana reacted by crying.

V. Jobs Outside the Home

In only three cities did any significant number of children have a job outside the home. These were London and Chicago, with nineteen percent and twenty-four percent; and Austin, where forty percent of the children in the sample had an outside job.

VI. Interpersonal Relations

In the area of Interpersonal Relations three types of responses to criticism by friends or siblings produced significant differences among countries. In Austin (fifty percent) and to a lesser extent in Ljubljana (thirty-six percent) and Milan (thirty-five percent) children gave a mild reaction, crying or arguing. In Mexico City, however, seventy percent of mothers reported that their children gave a strong reaction, quarrelling, using physical aggression and so on. The same was true to a lesser degree in London (fifty-eight percent) and Sao Paulo (forty-nine percent).

In keeping with this report, only twenty-three percent of Mexican mothers reported their children as getting on very well with other children. London and Chicago had the highest scores in this category (fifty-one percent). Significantly more Tokyo mothers (eighty-eight percent) reported an average relationship, sixty-one percent of Mexican mothers also regarding this as the best description of the child's relationship with other children.

Only in London, Milan and Chicago did more mothers give the response "excellent" rather than "average."

When asked about peer influences, over twenty-five percent of mothers in all cities except Ljubljana reported that their children were not influenced by their peers. In Germany, Milan and Mexico City the percentage was as high as fifty-six percent. Where parents did admit an influence it was given without any value judgment significantly more often in London, Tokyo, Austin and Chicago. Thus, a mother might say her daughter's choice of clothes was influenced by her peers but with no indication of whether she felt this was good or bad. In Ljubljana, however, a significant number of mothers (fifty-nine percent) were ready to acknowledge that the peer influence on their children was good. There were no significant differences among the numbers in each city who acknowledged a peer influence but did not comment further.

That children were sensitive to their friends' reactions was clear from responses given in the situation where their feelings had been hurt. Significantly more mothers in Sao Paulo, London, Mexico City and Austin reported their children as becoming depressed or anxious, while in Germany, Milan and Tokyo significantly more children became angry and expressed themselves either verbally or physically. It was only in Ljubljana that any appreciable number of mothers (twenty-nine percent) indicated that their children ignored or withdrew from the person who did the hurting.

VII. Anxiety

As in the areas of behavior already discussed, reactions to worry varied from city to city. In Sao Paulo and Milan, significantly more mothers reported a negative emotional response. The child became depressed, lost control or became angry. In Germany, and to a lesser extent in Tokyo, children talked about the worry with someone else. In London significantly more children reacted to worry either by withdrawing to their room or by some physiological behavior which did not solve the problem, for example, biting their nails.

More children in Ljubljana, Milan, Germany and Mexico City were perceived by their mothers as worrying more about academic problems. Significantly more Austin mothers reported that their children worried about peer relationships or youth problems. Only London produced any appreciable number of reports that children worried about their own behavior.

Significantly more parents in Milan and Tokyo reported that their children did not turn to others for help if worried. Of those who did turn to others for help, significantly more children in Germany turned to their mother alone, while significantly more in London turned to both parents. The mother was the most popular figure everywhere except in London.

VIII. Aggression

Significantly more children in London, Tokyo, Mexico City and Austin were made angry by petty, everyday annoyances inflicted on them by others--someone picking on them, calling them names, and so on. More children in Germany were angered by what were termed major grievances --someone cheating or lying, the child being taken advantage of, unfair accusations. More children in Sao Paulo and Ljubljana were made angry by the behavior of parents or authority figures.

Significantly far more children in London responded to the situation provoking the anger in a hostile way. This included both verbal and physical hostility. In Austin, significantly more children expressed verbal hostility than in other cities except London, but when the two hostile codes were combined, 'ondon clearly had more responses in this category. More children in Tokyo were reported as responding in a hostile emotional manner but no mention was made of either verbal or physical action. In Ljubljana more children (twenty-five percent) than in other countries just withdrew from the situation.

When the child was angry with the mother, verbal aggression was mentioned significantly more in Tokyo, as was hostile emotional reaction. Twenty-one percent of Milanese children made an attempt to cope with their anger in some way, either by controlling their anger or resolving the misunderstanding. The only other city that came anywhere near the Milanese figure was Ljubljana with eleven percent. Significantly more children in Austin just withdrew from the situation while more in Ljubljana gave a depressive emotional reaction like crying. Only in Mexico City did twenty-five percent of the sample indicate that the child did nothing.

The pattern of behavior when the child was angry with the father was similar to that shown for the mother. Significantly more children in Tokyo gave a hostile emotional reaction. More children in Austin and Chicago just withdrew from the situation while in Milan and Mexico City more children did nothing in the face of the situation. Children in Austin and Chicago also had higher scores in the verbal aggression category.

When the situation was reversed and a friend was angry with the child more parents in London and Tokyo indicated that they did not know what their child did. Of those who did have some knowledge of behavior significantly more mothers in Mexico City indicated that the child simply withdrew or found new friends. More children in Ljubljana tried to cope with the problem (twenty-five percent) with Austin having twenty-one percent in this category. Ljubljana had significantly more children who either did nothing or ignored the friend altogether. More mothers in Sao Paulo and Tokyo simply denied that the situation existed, that is, they said their child's friends were never angry with them (fifteen percent in each city).

Parent-Child Relevant Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

In Sao Paulo and Mexico City significantly more mothers had never met their child's teacher. In London, Tokyo and Austin, although the mothers had met the teacher, it was only on a formal, routine occasion such as an Open Evening. Significantly more mothers in Ljubljana initiated a meeting with the teacher, taking more than a general interest in school affairs. In Milan more than fifty percent of the mothers showed a great interest in meeting the teacher and frequently discussed the child's progress with him. The city closest to Milan in this respect was Mexico City, where thirty-four percent of the mothers followed this behavior pattern. This question was not asked in Germany as here all parents met the teacher every eight weeks.

In all countries seventy-five percent or more of the parents tried to encourage their child in his schoolwork in some way. In Germany significantly more mothers helped with homework only (forty-four percent). Of those mothers who encouraged schoolwork as opposed to homework, significantly more in Chicago either provided tutors or special classes for their children or took them on museum visits or other trips of academic value. More mothers in Sao Paulo, Tokyo and Ljubljana placed the emphasis on discussing their children's schoolwork with them, encouraging them or talking about its importance for the future. Only in Mexico City did any appreciable number of mothers (twenty-eight percent) make use of rewards and punishments.

When it came to helping with homework, significantly more mothers in Germany (forty-five percent) and Ljubljana (thirty-six percent) said they did nothing to help. A further twenty-four percent in Ljubljana said they did nothing to help because it was unnecessary--the child did it on his own. Forty percent of Sao Paulo mothers also came in this category.

For more parents in Tokyo, Chicago, Austin and London, the most common behavior was a verbal reminder, ranging from just asking the child about his homework to frequent reminders. In Milan and Mexico City a large number of parents (sixty-five and fifty-five percent) made sure that the child did his homework and also checked it.

Significantly more parents in London, Germany and Austin felt that the school's job was to educate the child and to teach generally. Although significantly more mothers from these cities came in this category it proved the most popular category for all cities. Significantly more mothers in Milan (twenty-six percent) and Tokyo (thirty-one percent) indicated they regarded the school's job as that of character development while twenty-six percent of the mothers sampled in Ljubljana thought the school should give a preparation for life and work.

More mothers in Milan (eighteen percent) than elsewhere rated school as important rather than very or most important. Mothers in Germany and Tokyo regarded it as of the first importance more than mothers in other cities.

When mothers were asked why they felt school was important, sixty-eight percent of mothers in Mexico City indicated they saw it as a preparation for life. Mothers in London, Chicago, Austin and Ljubljana placed the most emphasis on socioeconomic reasons, while mothers in Milan saw it as important for the personal and social development of the child. Only in Germany did any number (nineteen percent) place stress on the academic aspects.

II. Authority

When they wanted their child to do something, more mothers in London (seventy-eight percent), Milan (sixty-eight percent) and Tokyo (seventy percent) initially made the request in a mild, polite way. Very few parents in these cities ever ordered or demanded that the child do something. Ordering or demanding was favored by more mothers in Mexico City and Ljubljana.

In Sao Paulo and London in particular it was found that once the request was made there was no need to follow it up for almost half the sample. Significantly more children in Mexico City and Austin needed reminding while more in Ljubljana had to be continually scolded before the task was done.

If they found their child was doing a job incorrectly more parents in London, Germany and Ljubljana would demonstrate the correct way. More in Austin would make the child do it again, while in Mexico City forty percent would reprimand the child or yell at him.

III. Interpersonal Relations

More mothers in London, Milan and Tokyo did nothing to help their children get along with others. Of those who did take some action, more in London and Tokyo encouraged social activity while forty-five percent of mothers in Ljubljana used a positive approach encouraging certain behavior or telling the child to be friendly. More mothers in Sao Paulo (sixteen percent) and Mexico City (fifteen percent) took what might be termed the negative approach discouraging certain behaviors such as fighting or being bossy. Mothers in Austin and Mexico City indicated that they gave their children advice but did not mention whether it was of the positive or negative type.

IV. Anxiety

When their child was worried, more mothers in London (fifty-three percent), Milan (fifty-six percent), Tokyo (fifty-five percent) and Ljubljana (sixty-nine percent) tried to bring about tension reduction either by giving the child support or reassurance or by suggesting some way in which he might forget the worry, for example by keeping busy.

Mothers in Germany and Mexico City counselled direct action at the source, while twenty-nine percent of mothers in Austin suggested that the child just accept the situation.

Parent Items

I. Academic Task Achievement

In all cities except Tokyo and Sao Paulo half the mothers interviewed had not taken any courses since they left school. Significantly more from Milan, Austin and Ljubljana came in this category. Of those who had taken courses, more in London, Austin and Ljubljana had done so for professional or vocational reasons, nurses' training, for instance. More mothers in Tokyo had taken courses in flower arranging while more more mothers in Tokyo and Sao Paulo had taken domestic classes involving sewing and cooking.

Fifty-six percent of Tokyo mothers gave personal or social usefulness as the reason for taking a course, while significantly more mothers from Sao Paulo indicated that personal satisfaction was their motive. Mothers in London, Austin and Ljubljana gave vocational preparation as their main reason.

More mothers in Sao Paulo, London and Tokyo had taken their courses shortly after leaving school.

Of those taking courses, more mothers in Sao Paulo, Tokyo and Austin felt they gained from them than did those in other cities.

II. Occupational Aspects

Only in Ljubljana and London did more than half the mothers interviewed have a job. The sample with fewest working mothers was Mexico City, followed by Sao Paulo. Of those who did work, mothers in London, Ljubljana and Austin felt more positively about it than those in other cities. Mother mothers in Ljubljana liked their job because they had pleasant associates, while in London it was some special characteristic of the job itself which made the mother like it. Twenty-nine percent of London mothers said there was nothing about their job they disliked while in Ljubljana twenty percent indicated that they disliked their job because of some special characteristic it possessed. Thirty-eight percent of mothers in Ljubljana would not choose the same work if they had to do it again but thirty-one percent and thirty-six percent, in London and Austin respectively, would choose the same job.

When faced with a problem in the job situation more mothers in Ljubljana and Austin would tackle it alone. More mothers in London than elsewhere would seek help either from a co-worker or a supervisor.

More mothers in London and Ljubljana would try to get along with mothers who became angry because of some serious annoyance such as being cheated or lied to.

When asked how they reacted when they were angry, significantly more mothers in London (fifty-nine percent), Tokyo (fifty-three percent) and Chicago (fifty percent) indicated that they became verbally or physically aggressive, while more mothers in Sao Paulo just became depressed.

Only in Austin did any great number (twenty-eight percent) indicate that they would try to cope with the situation. In Sao Paulo, Milan, Mexico City and Ljubljana fifteen percent of the mothers would do nothing at all and, in some cases, just forget about the anger.